

MAY 9 1917

UNIV. OF MICH.
LIBRARY

The Classical Journal

PUBLISHED BY THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MIDDLE WEST AND SOUTH
WITH THE CO-OPERATION OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND
AND THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PACIFIC STATES

Volume XII

MAY 1917

Number 8

Editorial 497

Our Renaissance—Its Meaning, Aim, and Method
Henry Brown 501

An Alleged Blemish in the *Antigone* of Sophocles
H. D. Brackett 523

Latin of Tomorrow A. R. Wallis 535

Current Events
News from the Schools and Colleges 546

General Comment 552

Book Reviews 556

Museum of Fine Arts, Boston: Catalogue of Archaic Pottery, Chase (F. B. T.); The Year's Work in Classical Studies, 1915, Bailey (E. T. M.); Syria as a Roman Province, Bouchier (Ferguson); The Place-Names of England and Wales, Johnston (Hyde).

Recent Books 560

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

AGENTS

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, LONDON AND EIGHTH AVENUE

THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO,
FUKUOKA, SENDAI

THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, YOKOHAMA

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Published by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, with the co-operation
of the Classical Association of New England, and the Classical Association
of the Pacific States

Managing Editors

FRANK J. MILLER
University of Chicago

ARTHUR T. WALKER
University of Kansas

For New England
MONROE N. WETMORE
Williams College

For the Pacific States
HERBERT C. NUTTING
University of California

Associate Editors

GEORGE H. CHASE
Harvard University

FREDERICK C. EASTMAN
University of Iowa

CLARENCE W. GLEASON
Roxbury Latin School, Boston

DANIEL W. LOTHEMAN
East High School, Cleveland

WALTER MILLER
University of Missouri

JOHN A. SCOTT
Northwestern University

GILBERT C. SCOGGIN
University of Missouri

JULIANNE A. ROLLER
Franklin High School, Portland, Oregon

BERTHA GREEN
Hollywood High School, Los Angeles

The *Classical Journal* is published monthly except in July, August, and September. The subscription price is \$2.50 per year; the price of single copies is 30 cents. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. [Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Shanghai. [Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$2.65); on single copies, 2 cents (total 32 cents). For all other countries in the Postal Union, 24 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$2.74); on single copies, 3 cents (total, 33 cents). [Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to The University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following agents have been appointed and are authorized to quote the prices indicated:

For the British Empire: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C.4. Yearly subscriptions including postage, 11s. 3d. each; single copies, including postage, 1s. 4d. each.

For Japan and Korea: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, 11 to 16 Nihonbashi Tori Sancho-me, Tokyo, Japan. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, Yen 5.30 each; single copies, including postage, Yen 0.66 each.

For China: THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, 18 Peking Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions, \$2.50; single copies, 30 cents, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra, if mailed direct outside of Shanghai, on yearly subscriptions 24 cents, on single copies 3 cents.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit. Deliveries are not guaranteed within the war zones of Europe nor in other countries where transportation is disturbed by conditions incident to war.

Business correspondence should be addressed as follows:

1. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of the Middle West and South to LOUIS E. LORD, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio. The territory of the Association includes Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

2. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of New England to GEORGE E. HOWES, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

3. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of the Pacific States to M. E. DEUTSCH, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. The territory of this association includes California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and Arizona. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

4. Concerning subscriptions (not related to membership) to THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts should be sent either to FRANK J. MILLER, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., or to ARTHUR T. WALKER, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan.; from New England contributors, to MONROE N. WETMORE, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., and from the Pacific States to HERBERT C. NUTTING, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.

Fifty reprints of articles will be furnished gratis to authors. Additional copies, if ordered in advance of publication, will be supplied at cost.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME XII

MAY 1917

NUMBER 8

Editorial

[Our Secretary-Treasurer presents the following account of the annual meeting at Louisville, and of the present status of the affairs of the Association.]

The thirteenth annual meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South was held in Louisville, Kentucky, on April 5, 6, and 7, 1917. One hundred and fifty members of the Association were in attendance, but the number of persons present at the programs was much larger than this. The meeting was remarkable for its enthusiasm and for the close attention given to the papers presented on the program.

The Association was invited to Louisville by the University of Louisville, the Baptist and Presbyterian theological seminaries, and the Louisville Convention and Publicity League. Miss Olive B. Catlin, of the Girls' High School of Louisville, was chairman of the local committee, and to her efficient and untiring efforts the success of the meeting was largely due.

The Association was entertained at luncheon at the Hotel Seelbach on Friday by the University of Louisville and the Baptist and Presbyterian theological seminaries. A luncheon was given to the Association by the Domestic Science Department of the Girls' High School on Saturday.

For the first time in the history of the Association, one afternoon was given up to a social program. No papers were presented on Friday afternoon, but a theater party was given to the members of the Association at Keith's Theater by the Louisville Convention and Publicity League. Members of the Association who did not

attend this theater party were taken about the city in automobiles provided by the Publicity League. After the theater party a very pleasant reception was tendered to the members of the Association at the Hotel Watterson by the Publicity League. The enthusiasm with which this social program was received at Louisville seems to make it desirable that hereafter this custom should be continued and that the meetings of the Association should cover two days and a half instead of two days.

While the program for the meetings seemed unusually long, the papers were strictly limited in time and each session was closed promptly. The careful attention given by the audience to the papers was exceedingly gratifying.

David M. Robinson, of the Johns Hopkins University, was the guest of the Association. He presented a very interesting discussion of "Classical Sites in Asia Minor, including the Seven Churches." Miss Jessie Allen, of the Girls' High School, Philadelphia, represented the Classical Association of the Atlantic States. She spoke on "The Importance of Good Teaching as a Basis for Lasting Interest in Latin."

An unusual feature of the meeting this year was a special program prepared by Miss Frances E. Sabin, of the University of Wisconsin, on "Saving Latin by the Teaching of Latin."

The excellent program was the result of the untiring work of the president of the Association, Professor John A. Scott, of Northwestern University, who presided in his usual happy manner. Professor Scott spoke on Thursday evening on "The Dardanelles and the Lands Beyond." One of the interesting suggestions made by Professor Barton in his "Hoc erat in Votis" was that one feature of the program hereafter be a presidential address. It is expected that this suggestion will be adopted next year.

The officers elected for next year are: President, Charles N. Smiley, Grinnell, Iowa; First Vice-President, Daniel A. Penick, Austin, Texas; Secretary-Treasurer, Louis E. Lord, Oberlin, Ohio; member of the Executive Committee, J. B. Pike, Minneapolis, Minnesota. A list of the state vice-presidents for next year will be found on the third cover page of the *Journal*. The Association voted to continue the Committee on Latin Investigation of which

Miss Myra H. Hanson, of Toledo, Ohio, is chairman. A Committee on New Allies is to be appointed, and a new committee, Professor H. J. Barton, chairman, was organized to suggest practical means by which the Association can foster the teaching of Latin. The Association also voted to provide for the publication in the *Journal* next year of a list of lantern slides which may be used for the illustration of high-school Latin texts.

The question of the delimitation of the territory of the Association was also settled. The border states—Arizona, Nevada, Montana, and Idaho—are to belong to the Pacific Association. The entire territory of the United States is now organized under the following associations: the Classical Association of the Pacific States, the Classical Association of the Atlantic States, the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, and the Classical Association of New England. In view of the excellent financial condition of the Association, it was voted to increase the size of the *Journal* next year to eighty pages in each issue if the Editors think such an increase justified. An additional appropriation for the Secretary's office will make possible next year the employment of a clerk who shall give his full time to the interests of the Association. This should result in a largely increased membership.

For several years there has been a constant call for a list of members of the Association. Such a list will be printed in the June number of the *Journal* and a thousand extra copies of the list will be made. Members of the Association who find error in the addresses of the *Classical Journal* should notify the Secretary promptly of these errors so that the list as published in the June issue may be as nearly correct as possible.

The Secretary's report shows membership in the Association by states in Table I. The slight increase over last year is accounted for by three facts: first, Montana and Idaho have been transferred to the Pacific Association; second, the figures for last year represent the membership nearly a month later; third, the cancellation of institutional memberships has cost the Association over one hundred members.

A gratifying feature of the membership is that last year only 503 members of the Association were subscribers to *Classical*

Philology; this year there are 614. The Association should be congratulated on the largely increased circulation of its organ, the *Classical Journal*. The monthly edition of the *Journal* is now usually 3,400. Last year at this time it was only 2,700. There are about 3,200 paid subscriptions to the *Journal*, which represents, probably, a larger circulation than that of any other classical periodical in the country. The increased size of the *Journal* has not decreased the quality of the matter printed and has greatly stimulated the circulation. The Editors of the *Journal* are to be congratulated.

TABLE I

State	1915-16	1916-17	State	1915-16	1916-17
Alabama.....	19	17	North Carolina.....	24	14
Arkansas.....	18	19	North Dakota.....	20	21
Colorado.....	40	39	Ohio.....	231	253
Florida.....	24	37	Oklahoma.....	28	24
Georgia.....	23	17	South Carolina.....	8	8
Illinois.....	269	275	South Dakota.....	15	17
Indiana.....	154	177	Tennessee.....	56	54
Iowa.....	152	149	Texas.....	80	107
Louisiana.....	27	28	Utah.....	11	15
Kansas.....	134	110	Virginia.....	37	33
Kentucky.....	45	43	West Virginia.....	18	13
Michigan.....	125	138	Wisconsin.....	86	85
Minnesota.....	47	45	Wyoming.....	3
Mississippi.....	16	18	Out of territory.....	50	23
Missouri.....	105	95			
Nebraska.....	78	59	Total.....	1,940	1,941
New Mexico.....	5			

The Treasurer's books show a balance of \$1,963.45, a considerable increase over the cash balance of last year. The complete report of the Treasurer will be published in the October issue of the *Journal*.

The place at which the Association is to meet next year is as yet undecided. The selection of the place of meeting was left with power to the Executive Committee and its decision will be published in an early issue.

OUR RENAISSANCE—ITS MEANING, AIM, AND METHOD¹

BY REV. PROFESSOR HENRY BROWNE, S.J., M.A.
University College, Dublin, Ireland

I am to speak to you on a great subject tonight, and one that does not require a long introduction. But I am sure that it is only fitting that I should say one preliminary word, an expression of my gratitude to those who asked me to address you on such an occasion as the present meeting. This is my first visit to America, and I have come in a representative capacity. A section of the British Association with which I am co-operating felt that your methods of classical teaching are in certain respects superior to those in use in Great Britain, and I am come to be able to report on those methods. Hence my proper function tonight would appear to be to see rather than be seen—to listen rather than be listened to; but when your Classical Association complimented me by offering to listen to my ideas as to the aims and methods of that classical renaissance in which your organization is taking a leading part in America, I felt that the honor was one which it would be ungracious for me to decline.

It is impossible for those who are concerned in our renaissance to forget that the great revival of classical learning a few centuries ago was not only the commencement of all modern history, but that it has a very particular interest for your nation. Undoubtedly the discovery of America was the direct outcome of that wonderful stirring of men's minds and hearts which closed the old era and heralded the new. Nor will you who are involved in the effort to revivify the classical learning in the twentieth century object to my comparing that effort, modest though it may be, relatively speaking, with the Renaissance of the fifteenth century. The aim of those great humanists was no doubt a great one, but we claim

¹ Read before the twelfth annual meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South.

to have one identically similar. They called themselves humanists just because they wanted to benefit humanity as a whole and not in any sectional degree. We too believe, and we try to convince others, that the restoration of classical study on rational lines would be a real boon to human education all along the line and a real contribution to the most vital welfare of human society. They were certainly enthusiasts—we are nothing if not that. They founded academies to promote their cause in the great centers of Italian, and later of north European, culture; we have founded classical associations all over the world—in England 10, in Scotland, Wales, and Ireland 3, in America 4, in Australia 3, in India 1. They aroused opposition, they were decried and sometimes misunderstood; we ourselves—well, it is the fate of all good people, is it not? Above all they came to stay; I am not going to say where we shall be in five hundred years time, but I will say this—we are not going to be got rid of very easily, and I hope we shall give a fairly good account of our stewardship.

There are, however, two points of contrast which I should like to indicate between the position of the great humanists and our own. It was very clearly pointed out by the late Sir Richard Jebb of Oxford that the revival of learning owed very little to the universities; on the contrary, it was viewed with great suspicion by the universities which were naturally impregnated with mediaeval ideas. Now on the whole, even though there may have been some exceptions here and there, the universities have done very well by our movement and have generally extended a generous sympathy and encouragement to the work of the classical associations. Again, the Renaissance, at least in its earlier stages, was distinctly an aristocratic movement. Our movement, on the contrary, appeals directly to the mass of the people. We are trying to democratize classical study; we strain our efforts to bring home to the ordinary men and women of today the conviction that they must by no means allow the ancient learning to be crowded out in the educational struggle for existence, unless they would deprive themselves and their children of a precious inheritance. We tell them that without a knowledge of the earlier phases of history and letters, all their mental culture would become sickly and anemic, that the

very soul of humanity would be wounded and enfeebled, and that not merely in their academic life, but in their social and civic relationships, men would be poorer and the standards of their loyal service would be lowered through daring to despise the record of the past.

In the remarks which I shall offer in illustration of this thesis I shall take it for granted that you as members of an almost national classical association believe with me that no mental discipline can be better than that which aims at producing an understanding of, and a reasonable sympathy with, classical life and more particularly Hellenism. But let this attitude of ours be clearly understood. We do not by any means contend that the Greeks were free from faults in their character, in their domestic life, or above all in their politics. We may learn a great deal from their deficiencies and it is no part of our thesis that any nation has ever been or indeed can be perfect. What we maintain is that from any human standpoint the Greeks were incomparably the greatest people the world has ever known, and that they were so on account of their ideals, or rather because they knew how to translate their ideals into reality. What is true of a man is true of a nation. A dreamer is no good. The Greeks were not dreamers, they were practical people. That is my thesis, to put it as short as I can. And now I will try to prove it.

In the domain of art and literature, which has a great influence upon idealism, nobody doubts that the Greeks were supreme. But I believe that the champions of Hellenism do wrong to it by harping so much on one side of the question that they forget to insist on other aspects which are quite as important. It is all very well to insist on the excellence of Greek poetry and Greek drama, and on the importance of Greek sculpture in the history of high art; but in saying this let us never forget the greatness of Greece in quite other realms. What I may call the more human and even material side of Greek achievement ought not to be overlooked.

Poetry of course is a great thing, but only in so far as it is a genuine index of the human spirit in its finest aspiration. If we are to divorce it from all that it rightly and necessarily implies, if we are to regard it as a sort of graceful recreation or exotic bloom

of beauty, then I hold it a very doubtful proposition that this would be the best mental pabulum with which our youth could possibly be provided. Aristotle classes poets with lunatics—at least they are often dreamers, and dreamers many people hold in abomination. But the great poets of the world, the Homers, and the Vergils and the Dantes, were not dreamers—they were very strenuous persons, and they left the world a deal richer and better than they found it. When human nature is raised to its highest power by patriotism, holy ambition, love, or religion, then the voice of the poet will make itself heard; emotions thrive by expression, and hence the true educationist, who is a vital person, knows that poetry has value in promoting the vital activities of the human soul.

I have said this because I want you clearly to understand that if I take your thoughts away from the more aesthetic side of the classical revival tonight it is not because I undervalue Greek art and Greek and Roman poetry. But it is my belief that as long as we emphasize what is more or less obvious, namely, the supremacy of the Greek mind in the world of art and literature, we may easily lose our bearings. The questions which I shall raise are broader and more vital than any question of mere artistic excellence.

Let us now turn to the subject of Greek politics. At first sight they appear to have been rather futile. If for instance we compare the external history of Greece with that of Rome, we are at once struck by a strong and painful contrast. By the might of their hands the Romans built up a large and lasting empire which beyond question civilized Europe and contributed to the progress of the human race. And what picture does Greek history present? Chiefly a weltering mass of ineffectual and incohesive city-states without unity of aim or any very important achievements in the political order. To say that the civilization spread by Rome was mainly Greek in its character is to enunciate a fact, and of course it is an important fact, but one not exactly to the point. The intellect of Greece undoubtedly conquered Rome and that just at the time when Rome became the great world-power; but we are speaking now, not of the triumphs of the intellect, but of political efficiency. Human progress demands intellect also, but it is mainly a matter of strength—of strength practically applied and wisely

utilized for the betterment of human society. Let us therefore recall what Greece effected for mankind in the days of her strength, not in the way of the spirit only, but also in the external order of warfare, commerce, and state administration. It must be granted that owing partly to temperamental and climatic conditions Greece was never properly unified, nor was her strength fully turned to account by the practical methods which imperial Rome employed. What I have to insist upon is that this very contrast may cause us to forget or to underestimate the genuine military and political record of the Hellenic people.

Before going into the details of Greek history we might ask why it is so conspicuous for the absence of national unity and of political concentration of energy? This was due to the existence of the city-state. Every true Hellene was proud to belong to a sovereign city and to have a direct and personal share of its government—a share which might vary indeed in the different constitutions, but which was always the one thing that marked off the free citizen from the slave or the metic. This love of freedom and of citizenship was a passion with the Greeks; when they called foreigners *barbaroi* they meant first and foremost that they were not free citizens. To trace this idea down through the ages, to show how the democratic principles which we cherish are a very direct inheritance from our Hellenic forerunners, would be an interesting task, but perhaps a trifle obvious. This tendency of the Greek mind has been so often referred to that we may, I think, take it for granted tonight. I merely wish to repeat that if the Greeks rendered a service to humanity (and especially I might add to America) by their love of civic freedom, which meant what we call municipal as distinct from national politics, it is easy for us to understand how for them imperialism or even nationality in the fullest sense was sadly undeveloped. The Athenian Empire was perhaps the least galling of the different hegemonies which we know sprang up at various periods of history upon Greek soil. It was also perhaps the best effort made toward realizing Greek national unity, and yet we know how it failed. Every city that belonged to it in its later and more developed form felt gravely humiliated by the very fact of being included in the Athenian Empire and every individual owning

allegiance to a subject city felt something was wanting to his dignity as a Hellene.

Such was democratic feeling among the Greeks, a blessed heirloom for ages yet unborn, and a great force, as events proved, even in war, but one that carried with it many drawbacks for the external efficiency of the Hellenic race. If then I can prove, as I intend to, that in spite of such serious drawbacks Greek policy was by no means as abortive of permanent results as one could easily conclude, I shall consider that their title to our admiration and gratitude becomes clearer to us by reason of the difficulties which they encountered.

I need not speak of Marathon, Thermopylae, and Salamis. You will take for granted that at least for a moment the Greeks did put up a splendid fight in their struggle with the Persian invader. But when we look at the final result of these great victories we are undoubtedly disappointed to find that within a century Persia is again exercising a kind of predominant influence over the Greeks, somewhat subtle, perhaps, but practically so like her former overlordship as hardly to be worth distinguishing from it. Again when Alexander invades Persia in return and overruns the Eastern Empire like a human tornado, we find that after less than a generation his dreams have been to a large extent frustrated, and the work he accomplished is undone. You might urge this point and say, Of course the Greeks were brilliant fighters, for they were brilliant at everything, but did they know how to press home their victory, did they achieve any permanent results? For we have a right to inquire about any national policy what Mrs. Siddons asked the shopman about his fabric when she struck her stage attitude and shouted to him in tragedy tones, "Young man, but will this wash?"

I would submit then that there is another side to the story of Greek warfare and statesmanship. Let us take a broader outlook. What is the greatest outstanding feature in the history of Europe and indeed of the whole world? It is what is often called the eternal question, the ever-abiding struggle for supremacy between East and West. The Orient was first in the field, it put up a great fight when challenged, it has never been quite defeated, we cannot say today that it ever will be. I need not particularize. I prefer

not to speak of current events, of the Pacific, of those Semite influences which are so potent in our midst.

But I say this. On the whole we of the West have had the best of the struggle, and for this we have first and foremost to thank the Greeks. No one who fails to see this has read Greek history to any purpose. He has failed to see the forest for the leaves. Besides, I am sure that students of Greek history suffer from allowing themselves to be so much dazzled by the movements of extreme brilliancy that they comparatively neglect whole periods, which though less noteworthy from the standpoint of literature and art yet demand our serious attention. *Erant fortes ante Agamemnona*, and long before the days of Marathon the Greeks had done mighty acts of valor. One advantage accruing to the archaeological discoveries of our times is that the attention of Greek scholars has been riveted on the beginnings of Hellenism, and we are now for the first time able to speak with relative confidence of the earlier periods of Greek social and political life. We are in a position to realize better than formerly the conditions which prevailed in Europe when after a period of confusion known as the Dark Age the Greek race first began to rise from obscurity and to have a consciousness of its own nationhood. We know that after the break-up of Minoan civilization in the thirteenth and twelfth centuries before Christ, the men of Canaan or Phoenicia were for a time supreme in the waterways of the West. With their galleys built from the pines and cedars of the Lebanon they swept the seas, carried on their world-wide commerce in dye-stuffs, glass, ivories, gems and metal work, spices and perfumes, and all the products of the Near and Far East, spread the use of arithmetic and alphabetic writing among the people of the coast and thus kept alive the torch of humanism. This was the heyday of the Orient in the West, and it was owing to the activity and enterprise of the Ionic Greeks that these Phoenician merchants soon lost the supremacy of the Mediterranean. We need not deny that Europe was indebted to these Asiatic sealords for much that is valuable in its civilization, yet after all we are Westerners—you are Westerners even though you belong only to the Association of the Middle-West. You will not, I take it, anyhow, regret that the destinies of the human race were

not left to the hands of Phoenicians to be finally disposed of. We have almost no monumental or literary records of the period. Homer had passed away; in the *Odyssey* no doubt we get a glimpse of the beginnings of Ionian wanderings in search of new fields of activity. But at the dawn of Greek history, at the beginning of the eighth century, we find the Ionians had already pushed their way into the Euxine, had seized its gates—the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus—and had begun to plant in those parts colonies which rapidly rose to positions of importance. In the West, Cumae, far up the western coast of Italy, had been already founded and not later than 700 B.C. (according to the newest chronology based on recent examination of pottery) the Greek cities of Sicily, including Syracuse, had begun to flourish. At this date, therefore, clearly the Phoenicians must have been driven away from Greek waters to the West, where they founded the new empire which afterward fought with Rome so valiantly for the hegemony of Europe and the world.

Our knowledge, then, of the struggle which ended in the victory of the Ionian Greeks over the Orient is extremely limited. All we can say of it is that it must have been a bitter struggle extending over many centuries, and that when we count Greek history as commencing, this wonderful people had already shown their grit and had tasted the delights of hard-won victory.

Next after this period of struggle for the command of the sea and long before what is generally considered the classical period (I mean of course the days of Miltiades and Pericles), came the age of tyrants, a period to which justice has not always been done by historians. The reason for this no doubt is that the Greeks themselves after they had reached the full stature of their liberty and democratic power naturally looked back with disdain upon a period when Greeks like Orientals owned allegiance to a master. Despots, in any complete sense of the word, the tyrants were not; yet the later Greeks were ashamed of the very name, which probably is not a Hellenic word, and certainly was something uncongenial to Hellenic temperament. Yet the age of tyrants was a great age—it has even been maintained that it was the greatest age of the Greeks. At least Freeman, who was a supreme authority on classi-

cal history, and was strongly devoted to Hellenism and not disposed to write paradoxes, has gone so far as to maintain that when the Greeks had to defend themselves against foreign invasion, it was a sign that their real power was beginning to wane, and that the day of their greatest military glory was already overpast before the era of the Persian Wars.

I shall not argue this point further, but I will content myself with stating that we are wrong if we regard the success of the Greeks in the Persian Wars in the light of a startling episode of the history of Europe. I would submit that it was nothing of the sort; it was the climax of a long period of conquest, and it was most assuredly a beginning of new and significant exploits. It is true that the Greeks allowed it to appear in the immediate sequel that Persia held the winning hand, though she did not. This was folly if you will, and truly it shows up all the weakness of Greek political effort. I am not defending the foreign policy of the Greeks, but only the essential virility of their nature, which is a different thing and quite consistent with bad imperialism.

Something similar has to be asserted of the later periods of Greek history. The success of Alexander may easily be misunderstood. I need not argue the point that though Alexander was not a pure Greek, his triumphs were the triumphs of Hellenism quite as truly as the victories of Napoleon were French victories. For Napoleon was not a Frenchman in any full sense and yet he led Frenchmen to battle and was entirely absorbed in a French enterprise. All serious students of Greek history know what is not quite on the surface, namely, that Alexander's conquest of the East was the direct result of previous Greek warfare, and in particular of victories gained by Greek troops led by Cyrus over the armies of the Orient about 70 years before Alexander reigned in Macedon. If we study history superficially, we are likely to be struck by isolated events, especially if they are of the nature of a cataclysm. But the deeper currents of human life, the real causes which lead up to surprising results, are not so readily discerned; and it seems to me that this is very true of the warfare waged by Greek arms against the powers with which during her career she came into conflict—whether Phoenicians, Persians, Egyptians,

Thracians or other barbarians by whom she was surrounded, including later on the Gauls who were overcome by Macedon and Pergamum. The truth seems to me to be that this warfare was searching and continuous, and that, in spite of the heavy handicap that her warfare on the whole was badly organized, she came out victorious. In spite of her incurable disunion, a fault which her enemies knew only too well how to take advantage of, somehow she managed to keep her end up. Through the centuries she was often depressed. Miletus fell. Athens fell twice. Sicily was hard pressed by her own tyrants. Macedon faltered. Pyrrhus was conquered. Corinth was finally wiped out. But in spite of it all Greece did her work, and all things considered she did not do it badly.

One more word before I leave the question of Greek external policy to consider quite a different aspect of my subject. In speaking about Greek history I have treated it as isolated and even in a sense as contrasted with Roman history. Now that is precisely not the way in which I conceive that the subject should be practically dealt with. It is really when we combine the study of democratic Greece with that of imperial Rome, and only then, that we provide a perfect historical discipline for our youth. I am not now referring to the spiritual debt of Rome to Greece, to the fact that Roman civilization all along the line was almost pure and undiluted Hellenism. I do not wish to mix matters. I am talking of politics, or civics, if you will, and not of things of the intellect or the spirit. If we consider the history of Greece and Rome side by side, as of course we do in classical education, the very contrast they present to the student's mind appears to be of extreme utility. We see on the one hand the great success of a huge imperial system clouded by many defects, many sins, much suffering, and frequent local failures. The fact that the Greeks also had their sins and their failures, though they proceeded from quite distinct, and often from opposite causes, is equally illuminating. We may at least learn the lesson of the golden mean and we may also learn the principle which we can never learn too often—*humanum est errare*. Human life consists of failures as well as successes, and the road to success as often as not is through failures. We "sow in tears to reap in joy."

But once more, the debt that Rome owed to Greece, even in a military sense, was immense; this fact too may be easily obscured and forgotten. Except in the extreme West, except in the case of Gaul, Spain, and Britain, the Roman Empire was the direct heir of the great empires carved out of Alexander's conquests, Syria, Egypt, Pergamum, to say nothing of Macedon herself. The Diadochi were really great men; as imperialists they bear comparison with any of the great Romans except perhaps Caesar and Trajan, who alone could be equated with Alexander himself. The Hellenistic period is now slowly coming into its own, its significance is being gradually grasped. We may hold that, comparatively speaking, the period of the struggle between Greece and Rome was also a period of Greek political decadence. But if this is so, what then are we to say of the really great days of the Greeks, before Rome had yet come upon the scene? I have dealt with this aspect of Greek history because it can be so easily passed over. I know that it is so because of my own experience in regard to mental results acquired from the Greek studies to which I have devoted many years of my life. I feel that it was at a late period of my progress that I came fully to grasp what I now realize to be the true position of Greece in the external history of Europe.

After this very brief and inadequate outline of the educational bearings of Greek history as I conceive them, we must now proceed to quite a different aspect of the revival of Hellenic studies. I have referred to my own experience, and I shall now ask you to let me speak of what is even more intimately personal than this reading of Greek history: I refer to the subject of religion. Seriously to introduce this topic before a secular association is, I know, to approach a delicate question. Yet I have confidence in an American audience. There is something reassuring in the very atmosphere breathed in this land of liberty. And if I speak to you frankly and fearlessly of the most sacred interests of human life, I know that you will give me a fair and perhaps even a sympathetic hearing. I stand before you, it is true, confessed as a member of the clerical profession, but I trust that you will find that my remarks transcend all danger or suspicion of clerical bias.

Among, then, ordinarily thoughtful persons there is, we must sorrowfully admit, a great gulf fixed by reason of our religious predispositions and antipathies. But we ought to be conscious that underlying all our theological differences, many of us own much that is common. Whether Catholics or Protestants, agnostics, or even some of those who are called atheists, we hold in common certain fundamental convictions. We all believe, do we not, in some sort of ideal goodness, in the ultimate triumph of right, in the power that everyone has of doing his bit, be it great or small, to promote the cause of goodness in the world? You will not misunderstand my drift nor apprehend that I am hinting that our theological creeds are unimportant things. I of course hold them to be most vitally important; but just because of that, I hold also that those truths which underlie theological belief are the most important of all—because without a strong conviction of fundamental religion, all theology must be formal, prefatory, and sterile.

And the reason why I wish to put this matter in a personal light is because in regard to religious matters every man has an undoubted right to speak for himself, but no one can properly speak for another.

My own experience then is this. As far as I can tell, any religion that I have been able to attain to, any religion in the deepest sense of the word, has been very largely influenced by my Greek studies. I don't say exclusively. I don't speak of supernatural grace. I don't refer to the most cogent arguments of a metaphysical sort. It is merely a psychological fact that I would record. In those dark hours which, I take it, all souls, Christian and pagan, have to experience, those hours of wrestling with doubt, with misgiving, with spiritual despondency, I have found no human document which has influenced me so poignantly as certain pages of Plato and, in particular, his description of the death of his great master which he has left us in the *Phaedo*. I can only name one Christian book (outside the canon of inspiration), whose *human* appeal can compete with that of Plato. I mean the *Confessions* of St. Augustine. But then the Bishop of Hippo was himself a close student of Plato; I do not say merely that he is tinged with Platonic feeling, I would rather describe him as a pure exponent of Platonism, of course run into

a Christian mold. And in fact he makes it clear that he owed his conversion to Christianity to his studies of Platonic philosophy.

Notice, however, that my attitude is not concerned with Plato's philosophy viewed as a speculation of the intellect. It is true that he exhausts all his force and ingenuity to prove the existence of a future life where a just Providence will reward virtue and punish the sinner; but it is also true that his arguments fail most palpably and even miserably. No, it is the potent influence of Plato's personality, his human insight, his love of truth, his reverence, his deep religious sense, which gains on the reader till he succumbs to the almost hypnotic influence of the man himself. People talk about Greek intellectuality as though that would explain the spell which the Greeks have cast over all the ages of the world. Their intellect was great, because they were great all around; and a man's intellect is no small part of him, but it is not by any means the whole. No man ever ruled his fellow-men by dominating their intellects. Plato can touch the heart: that is the secret of his strange influence. The curious thing is that Plato's mind has ruled the world's thinkers perhaps more than any other philosopher, and yet his philosophy as a system is very far to seek. It is not even quite intelligible. In this he stands in the strongest contrast to Aristotle, the Stagirite, whose thought is as clear, moderate, and systematic as it is wholly untinged by the emotion of his Athenian master.

Taking this pair of Greek philosophers together, what a glorious combination they make! Both of them are giants, both without a rival in his own sphere. Aristotle, too, did much for the philosophy of religion, for upon his thought is based the philosophy of the Christian church; but his intellect was perhaps too cold and undisturbed by emotion for him to produce in the hearts of men the response which Plato has evoked down the ages almost without interruption. Like his followers of his own Academy, we are still content to sit beneath Plato's feet, to gaze, to wonder, and to pray.

I say nothing about Greek philosophy as a whole, because mere human philosophy in its most formal sense is perhaps the one thing we could best do without. I pass over the fact that undoubtedly the Greeks did create philosophy and that the very word suggests

the fact. I prefer to take my stand upon the appeal made by Greek studies to the heart. I maintain that if indeed they can do something toward deepening in our hearts the very springs of sane religious feeling, surely this is a strong reason for hesitating to clear them out of the way in modern education. There is not too much real religion in the world, though undoubtedly there is often too much talk about it.

How far we seem to have wandered now from the question we were discussing about Alexander's conquests and the imperialism of the Athenian state! Yet to my mind the question of religion is nearer to war and statesmanship than it is to the aesthetic spirit, or the conscious persistent quest of types of beauty in nature and in art.

Here I am stating what I know is controversial. Perhaps many of you think there is or should be a clear connection between art and religion, between aestheticism and the religious spirit. These are difficult questions, and no one ought to be over-dogmatic in dealing with them. But as this question has arisen in our treatment of Hellenism, I may be allowed to express my own conviction as to the relation between religion and art. It is this. There have been undoubtedly some happy moments in the history of art when it went hand in hand with religion, but taking its history as a whole, and particularly looking at the art of the Renaissance and of our own modern life, I should say that the interests of art and of religion are by no means generally sympathetic. Religion inclines toward symbolism, and symbolism is frequently uncongenial to high art.

I thought it right to touch on this point, but it is really a side issue. Whether art and literature ordinarily promote religion or not, it is quite certain that they need not necessarily do so. My thesis is that one important aspect of Hellenism was its religious spirit. I am out against the one-sided and very injurious belief that when you have called the Greeks an aesthetic people you have said all that need be said about them.

In an address like this, in which one deals with a large and comprehensive subject, it is hardly possible to treat exhaustively the topics which come crowding into one's thoughts. My aim tonight

has been to suggest lines of thought which might prove fruitful, to point to aspects of the classical revival which may be obscure and which are in danger of neglect. One thing must strike any thoughtful investigator in the highways and byways of Hellenic life and thought, and that is the extraordinary complexity of Greek nature—which I suppose may be partly accounted for by its rich endowments.

If, having grasped the significance of Greek life and Greek achievement in its totality, you then turn to consider Greek art and poetry, you will be able to estimate it at its true value. You will say that Greece was bound to produce high art. You will have no temptation to undervalue it, but you will certainly place it in its true perspective. Because Greek nature was glorious, because Greek life was full, varied, and complete, because Greek emotion was stirred to strive for the best, therefore Greek hands could build a Parthenon, Greek voices could chant sweetly Pindar's songs of victory or Sophocles' Ode to Colonus, or Euripides' invocation of the god of love.

But let us be fair even to the Greeks. Do not call them a nation of poets and sculptors and dramatists. Sinners they may have been, but do not brand them as aesthetic. Plutarch says of Pericles that he alone left a sting in their ear when he addressed an Athenian audience. But Pericles did more than make speeches to the mob of Athens.

Before concluding I have still a suggestion to make, and here I will address myself not so much to those who as members of a classical association are interested in preserving the ancient culture, but rather to those who are eager to drive Greek studies away as something antiquated and useless to the citizens of a modern state.

Now what is the discipline which the enemies of classical training propose to offer us as its substitute? It is generally what is known as scientific education. It is of course taken for granted that the advocates of Latin and Greek studies are opposed to the teaching of science. This, however, would be (at least I speak for myself) a most untrue allegation. Our renaissance, if it means anything, means the revival of humanism, and science properly understood is in a high sense a very important part of humanism.

It is quite true that we do not all approve of modern scientists and of their aims and methods, but we by no means disapprove of the teaching of science in its proper way and in its proper place. And this is a point to be strongly insisted upon.

We should be very poor Hellenists if we did not glory in the fact that modern science quite as much as philosophy, poetry, and art was a gift from Greece to humanity. It is only one of their gifts—many Hellenists consider it is the greatest—but it is unnecessary for us to discuss that question. What I want to do is to give you an outline (and it must be very imperfect in the short space that remains at my command) of the debt which the world is under in this respect to the intellect, the perseverance, and the practical wisdom of the Greeks. I shall touch upon mathematics and astronomy as representing theoretic science, and upon medicine as representing practical or applied science in one of its most necessary aspects.

And what is very important for us to observe in this connection is not merely the marvelous degree of scientific knowledge attained to by the Greeks; but the much more important fact that at the time when modern science took its rise at the Revival of Learning, it was owing to the rediscovery of Roman and Greek scientific writings and the recovery of the threads of ancient research which had been lost sight of during mediaeval times, that the great pioneers of modern discovery were enabled to do their work. Nay more, we shall not understand the very essence of the humanistic movement if we do not realize that the revival of letters was viewed by many of the promoters much more as a means than as an end. That is, while many were engaged in the quest of literature for its own sake, many others were seeking above all to disinter the scientific treatises of Roman but much more of Greek authors. Professor John Burnet has written excellently on this subject, and as instances of the demand for scientific books he has pointed out that as early as 1482 Euclid's *Geometry* was printed in Latin, and in Greek in 1533, whereas the works of Hippocrates on medical science appeared in 1525 in Latin, and in the Greek original in the year following.

In modern astronomical research the epoch-making event was of course the announcement by Copernicus of the system which

bears his name, which regards the sun, not the earth, as the center of the planetary orbits. Now Copernicus tells us in his own writing that he derived this idea directly from the Greeks; it was in fact known to them as the Pythagorean theory, and, though not commonly believed in ancient times, it had been distinctly upheld by several Greek philosophers. It is true that the ancients had not strictly proved this theory, but then Copernicus did not either, though no doubt he argued in favor of it. Proctor says that it may be greatly doubted whether Copernicus rendered services to astronomy which were commensurate with his great fame. He left it to his successors and in particular to Kepler and Galileo to dispose finally of the geocentric theory, which everyone knows had held its ground unquestioned throughout mediaeval times. What Copernicus himself had done was to bring before the minds of men, and to familiarize them with a theory which the Greeks really originated, and for which we ought to allow them their full degree of credit.

In like manner the Greeks were great anatomists, though perhaps Aristotle, in spite of his clear insight into many physical as well as philosophical problems, may have set back Greek medical science in regard to the relative importance of the brain and the heart. But the Greek knowledge of surgery and medicine was really very advanced. Hippocrates, who lived in the Periclean era, was eminently practical; he certainly knew of the circulation of the blood. What Harvey did was merely to make it certain by completing the proof of it. Moreover, it is no exaggeration to say that Hippocrates gave a form and substance to medical science which it has never lost. Many of his views were of course wrong and have been since rejected; but that is the common part of all human speculation, and after all the Greeks were but human.

I cannot pursue this subject in detail, but I would warmly commend the history of Greek scientific discovery to the members of this Association and to all who are desirous of reconstituting modern Greek study on a satisfactory basis, and of securing its due appeal to the practical thought of our own generation.

About mathematical science I will say one word. Its very name tells us a great deal. *Mathema* means properly "learning," and the

word reminds us that this was *par excellence* the Greek study. Plato was quite eminent as a mathematician; he had written over his Academy, *μηδὲς ἀγεωμέτρητος εἰσὶν* and there can be little doubt that his capacity for this study had been quickened by his intercourse with the Pythagorean philosophers to whom he owed in part also his theory of ideals. Pythagoras had seen in the proportions of beauty and in the arithmetic relations of musical tones reason to suspect that all things could be explained by numbers; and Plato found this theory congenial. The extraordinary advances made by Greek thinkers in geometry and astronomy constitutes most interesting history; besides, their mathematical science has stood the test of time to a far greater extent than their merely physical theories of the universe. It follows from these few facts that the Greeks were as great in science as they were in all other lines of human endeavor, including their achievement in art and literature. And how can we account for the desire of modern scientific men to rid themselves and all future generations of what they think are the shackles of classical and especially of Greek education? Are we really to believe that they are wholly indifferent to the early history of science, to its relation to other kinds of human achievement, to the wondrous way in which the human spirit has triumphed over space and time and all the obstacles presented to it by the inert matter of this universe?

This is what I meant when I drew attention to the humanistic aspect of science. No true educator can be wholly indifferent to anything human; human science, if not the highest thing in human life, yet certainly cannot be left out of the count as unimportant. The real truth perhaps is that these modern scientists who show such a lofty contempt for the achievements of their Greek forebears, whether in art, literature, philosophy, or science, are under the impression that our classical discipline is unpractical and out of date.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is not for me now to argue this question further. I will even exhort you not at all to argue the question whether the classics are out of date. It is our business in a classical association, not to argue about our faith, but to see how we can prove it to our pupils, prove it to their parents, prove it to the world at large. I hope that you will not think I have wasted a glorious

opportunity tonight because I have left little time to discuss what is directly practical or methodical in regard to classical education. I have already said that I came to America not to teach so much as to learn from you the best methods of vitalizing our subject and proving to our critics, whether friendly or the reverse, that we are not unpractical and that we are not out of date.

Nevertheless I will offer a few suggestions by laying down some definite principles as to method in classical teaching—principles which may be in themselves fairly obvious but which it may be you will like to hear distinctly enunciated in due order.

1. We must always try to combine breadth of view with accuracy. By breadth of view I mean a regard for large aspects of our subject. We must remember *the whole is greater than the part*. Classical study, as humanism views it, is the study of antiquity—not all antiquity, but such as regards our own origins, the forces which molded our civilization in its earlier stages.

The weakness, I might say the vice, of one sort of classical scholarship was that it allowed itself to become so interested and absorbed in certain aspects of literary study, that it neglected to ascertain the real relations and the real values of those matters of detail. There is here, I take it, some opposition between the methods of research and the methods of teaching. Research, to be successful, must be limited in its scope; the more limited it is, the more likely it is to succeed. Hence we see how enormous is the specialization prevailing in modern research—whether in science, history, or archaeology. Division of labor is the very soul of research (though even here there must be a higher co-ordination of many distinct lines of lower investigation). But in education, specialization is at least a danger. We must train our own minds and the minds of our students to regard matters of study in their true and vital relationship to the history of the human spirit. I hope I shall not be misunderstood in calling this spirit a psychological attitude of mind. I mean that we must value history, literature, poetry, drama, art, refinement of taste, and all humanism, chiefly as a function of that spiritual totality which we call mankind. Viewed in this light everything is of importance—even grammar and prosody become instinct with vital interest—whereas

apart from human psychology everything becomes tame and insipid, all is bitterness and affliction of spirit.

2. If our aim is to be thus psychological, our methods must be equally so. Hence we shall recognize the enormous importance of appealing to the senses of our students. We shall exhaust ourselves in the effort to bring home to them, by the sight of their eyes and by the appeal to their tactile sense, the facts of ancient life. We shall bring them immediately into the atmosphere of reality and we shall make an impression upon their mind by bringing before them real and tangible evidence of the true facts concerning ancient life. This is the appeal to archaeology. I have already been told by an authority in classical education in this country that there is if anything a tendency in America to overemphasize the use of archaeological aids to teaching. There can be no such overemphasis if archaeology is utilized in the right way and in the true spirit of enlightened humanism. But this brings me to my third point.

3. The use of archaeology in classical teaching is always subordinate to the psychological aim, i.e., it is never regarded as an end in itself but always strictly as a means to that end. Of all the false notions which I have observed in discussions on classical teaching none of them is so ridiculous as the idea that we, the reforming school, desire to substitute a smattering of archaeology for a more solid kind of classical training. I do not of course refer to the vagaries of exceptional individuals who may chance to be weak-minded and under-instructed enthusiasts. But I speak for the movement toward reform in its saner aspects—as I have tried to promote it, and shall continue to do to the best of my power. We reformers consider that it is a crime as well as a blunder on the part of classical teachers to neglect the opportunities provided by modern archaeological research for illuminating our subject and bringing it home to the minds and senses of our students. It is all very well to sneer at the cinematograph as something unspeakably degrading to modern society. But I know very well that if I wanted to learn how some action was really carried on I should rather see a cinematograph record than read an account of it by the most vivid of chroniclers. The Roman poet Lucretius under-

stood this principle very well: *Segnius irritant animos dimissa per aurem quam quae sint oculis subiecta fidelibus!* We cannot, I suppose, in our branch of study utilize the cinematograph, though I for one should not hesitate to do so were it in any way feasible. But to show our students good photographs of the countries, the buildings, the art, and the antiquities of the ancients; to place at their disposal originals or facsimiles of the coins, of the pottery, and the other art-products of the ancients as they are being unearthed by the modern excavator; to give them a clear vision of the great prehistoric fortresses and palaces of Gnosso, Troy, Tiryns, Mycenae, and Pylos, with the art and architecture of Greece and Rome as preserved at Olympia, Delphi, Paestum, Pompeii, and above all on the Acropolis of Athens and in the Roman Forum; in a word, to familiarize them with the realities of ancient life instead of confining their attention to mere ideas or mere names of things—this is not a council of perfection, but to neglect it is to leave out of our work something of real and vital importance; it is to be guilty of a sin of omission for which no efforts in other directions could wholly atone!

These principles, ladies and gentlemen, must be so obvious to the members of your association that I should almost apologize for enunciating them. But though you do much, you can perhaps do more; or you can at least renew your adhesion to the principles which I have suggested, if provided always that they commend themselves to your minds, as I feel little doubt they will, and while we realize the necessity of revising our methods and keeping them fully abreast of all that is good and wholesome in modern educational science, we shall do well to remind ourselves that there is also something deeper than method—something more far-reaching.

My word to the Classical Association of the Middle West and South is this: Take care of your ideals and the methods will take care of themselves. The Greeks were great because they had great ideals. In our educational endeavors, if our ideals are high the education we impart will be correspondingly high and our critics we may then leave securely alone.

AN ALLEGED BLEMISH IN THE *ANTIGONE* OF SOPHOCLES¹

BY H. D. BRACKETT
Clark College

The alleged blemish in Sophocles' tragedy the *Antigone* which I wish to consider in this paper has to do with the matter which is discussed by Jebb in the introduction to his large edition of the *Antigone* (3d ed., pp. xviii-xix) under the marginal heading "The Dramatic Blemish." The statement of the case here made by Jebb is substantially the same as the account given by Bellermand in the Wolff-Bellermand edition (5th ed., pp. 126 ff.); but because of the pre-eminence of Jebb's among English editions of Sophocles, because his edition is likely to have more direct influence among our college students of Sophocles, and because of the limitation of time, I direct my discussion primarily toward Jebb's statement of the matter in question.

First, then, what is the dramatic blemish which Jebb finds in the *Antigone*? Of the course of the tragedy up to the point about which our discussion centers I need give only a very rapid summary. The scene is laid before the royal palace at Thebes; the time is the morning after the day when the Argive army, led by Polyneices, has been defeated by the Thebans, Polyneices and Eteocles having fallen by each other's hand. Creon, having now become king, proclaims that the body of Polyneices shall be left unburied. Antigone, after appealing unsuccessfully to her sister Ismene to join her, defies the edict, gives ceremonial burial to the body of Polyneices, is detected, and brought before Creon, to whom she admits that she violated his decree knowingly and deliberately. Creon, who had previously proclaimed that anyone who violated his edict should be punished by being stoned to death in public, determines that Antigone shall be put to death. Haemon, Creon's

¹ Read at the meeting of the Classical Association of New England at Brown University, April 7, 1916.

son, after attempting without success to dissuade Creon from his proposed course of action, leaves the stage, his last words indicating to the spectators that he is resolved not to survive Antigone. Immediately after Haemon's departure Creon, upon the remonstrance of the chorus, renounces his intention to slay Ismene, but informs them that he purposes to slay Antigone by leaving her to starve in an underground tomb. In the next episode Antigone is led by guards from the palace and, in full view of Creon, who expresses not a word of sympathy, she passes from the stage on her way to the burial chamber where she is to be entombed. After an interval occupied by a choral song Teiresias enters. He informs Creon that the gods are offended by his failure to give burial rites to Polyneices, and urges him to bury him. Creon accuses Teiresias of acting under the influence of bribes and angrily and stubbornly refuses to change his purpose. Hereupon Teiresias, roused to wrath, prophesies the death of Creon's son, hints less clearly at other calamities for his family, and makes his exit. Creon is terrified by this prophecy, and his original purpose is so far shaken that he helplessly puts himself in the hands of the chorus and asks them what he shall do. Upon their bidding him to release Antigone and to bury Polyneices he at once gives orders to his attendants to proceed immediately to where Polyneices lies, and indicates that he will go in person with them.

After a brief hyporcheme a messenger enters and reports at once that Haemon is dead; and after the entrance of Eurydice, Creon's wife, he relates in detail what was done by Creon and his attendants: how they first buried Polyneices and raised a mound, then going to Antigone's tomb found her already dead by hanging; how they found Haemon bewailing her death, and how on the entrance of Creon into the tomb Haemon in a paroxysm of despair made a lunge at his father, missed him, and then in an access of swift remorse dealt himself a fatal blow. Eurydice leaves the stage without a word. Creon enters bearing the body of Haemon; the death of Eurydice is reported from the palace; Creon admits his stupidity and wrong and bewails his fate, and the play is ended.

The adverse criticism passed by Jebb upon a certain part of this play first appeared in print, so far as I know, in his first edition

(1888); it was retained word for word in his second and third editions (1891 and 1900 respectively); the third edition, Jebb informs us in his preface, he "carefully revised"; his discussion would seem therefore to express, not a hasty judgment, but his mature opinion. In stating Jebb's position I cannot do better than to state it for the most part in his own words:

Teiresias, as we saw, came with the benevolent purpose of warning Creon that he must bury Polyneices. Creon was stubborn, and Teiresias then said that the gods would punish him. Haemon would die, because his father had been guilty of two sins—burying Antigone alive, and dishonouring the corpse of Polyneices. This prophecy assumed that Creon would remain obdurate. But, in the event, he immediately yielded; he buried Polyneices, and attempted, though too late, to release Antigone. Now suppose that he had been in time to save Antigone. He would then have cancelled both his offences. And then, we must infer, the divine punishment predicted by Teiresias would have been averted, since the prediction does not rest on any statement that a specific term of grace had expired. Otherwise we should have to suppose that the seer did not know the true mind of the gods when he represented that Creon might still be saved by repentance (1025 ff.). But the dramatic function of Teiresias obviously requires us to assume that he was infallible whenever he spoke from "the signs of his art"; indeed, the play tells us that he was so (1094).

Everything depended, then, on Creon being in time to save Antigone. The Chorus puts Creon's duties in the natural order; "free the maiden from her rocky chamber, and make a tomb for the unburied dead" (1100); and Creon seems to feel that the release, as the more urgent task, ought to have precedence. Nevertheless, when he and his men arrive on the ground, his first care is given to Polyneices. After the rites have been performed, a high mound is raised. Only then does he proceed to Antigone's prison—and then it is too late. We are not given any reason for the burial being taken in hand before the release. The dramatic fault here has nothing to do with any estimate of the chances that Creon might actually have saved Antigone's life if he had gone to her first. The poet might have chosen to imagine her as destroying herself immediately after she had been left alone in her cell. In any case, the margin for Creon must have been a narrow one. The dramatic fault is that, while we, the spectators, are anxious that Antigone should be saved, and while every moment is precious, we are left to conjecture why Creon should be spending so many of these moments in burial rites which could have been rendered equally well after Antigone had been rescued: nay, when the rites have been finished, he remains to build a mound. The source of pathos contained in the words "too late" is available for Tragedy, but evidently there is one condition which must be observed. A fatal delay must not seem to be the result merely of negligence or of caprice.

Such is Jebb's criticism. In my judgment its main contentions are completely erroneous, the fundamental assumptions which underlie it are quite mistaken, and the conception of the poet is gravely misconceived. How generally is Jebb's conclusion accepted? A statement practically identical with Jebb's is found in Wolff's fourth edition, edited by Bellermann (1885). This, so far as I have seen, is the first appearance of this opinion; it was retained in the fifth edition, but is omitted in the sixth edition (1900). Of the editions most commonly used as textbooks in American colleges, Humphrey's edition (notes on vss. 1111, 1242) follows Jebb explicitly, especially as to his explanation of the reason for the assumed blemish. The Jebb-Schuckburgh school edition naturally follows the large edition. D'Ooge's edition, based on Wolff's second edition (1873), does not affirmatively support the blemish theory; the only mention of the matter is in a brief note on vs. 1110, quoted from Campbell, which hints at what I feel to be the sound opinion. Professor Palmer in his well-known translation gives to Jebb's theory his cordial approval ("as Professor Jebb admirably says" [p. 99]). Bayfield in his edition (Introd., p. xxix) considers Jebb's theory "highly probable." My own conclusion was reached before I had seen expressed any opinion differing from Jebb. Since then I have found a brief judgment similar to mine expressed by Campbell in a note in his large edition, vs. 1110 (second edition, 1879), and in his book *Tragic Drama in Aeschylus, Sophocles and Shakespeare*, p. 169—a statement occupying less than a page. Post in his rather careful study of Sophocles (*H.C.S.*, XXIII [1912], 71 ff.) does not mention this matter. Among the Germans, Seiler and Nake discuss the matter somewhat in Fleckeisen's *Jahrbücher*, CXLI (1890), 104 ff., 569 ff., 849 ff., Seiler raising some objections to Bellermann's statement, and Nake seeking to point out some errors in Seiler's discussion. I agree in part with both Seiler and Nake, but not entirely with either; owing to the limitation of time I shall here discuss the matter independently of both of them.

I realize that in the last analysis a question as to a defect in any work of art is a personal and subjective matter. In this case, however, as in most of such cases, certain questions of fact are

involved. I shall therefore attempt to distinguish as clearly as I can between matters of fact and matters of taste or opinion.

The first part of Jebb's criticism centers about the general implication of the words addressed by Teiresias to Creon, to the end of Teiresias' speech, vss. 998-1032. The lines which really determine this question are 996 and 1023-32. As to vs. 996 (Teiresias speaks), *φρόνει βεβῶς αὖ νῦν ἐπὶ ξυροῦ τύχης*, Jebb translates, "Mark that now once more thou standest on fate's fine edge."

In my judgment the phrase "on fate's fine edge" gives no clear and satisfactory meaning to *τύχης*. I believe that *τύχης* means here "misfortune," "calamity," a meaning of *τύχη* which is well authenticated in Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides (cf. *Aes. P.V.* 106; *Soph. O.C.* 1404; *Eur. Heracl.* 714; *Hec.* 786). I take the meaning to be therefore "Consider that now again you are standing on misfortune's razor-edge"; i.e., your equilibrium at the present time is very unstable and a slight error may cause you to fall into misfortune. Furthermore, it should be observed that it is possible that Teiresias by the use of *αὖ* here is referring to the death of Creon's son Megareus who, prompted by a prophecy of Teiresias, slew himself to secure the victory of the Thebans over the besieging Argive army.

In the first part of the long speech which follows Teiresias describes the bad omens which he read from the fighting birds and the burnt offerings, alleging that the altars and hearths have been tainted by birds and dogs with flesh from Polyneices' unburied body. He finishes with these words:

Think then my son on this. To err is common for all men; but when he has erred, that man is neither foolish nor unblest who, when he has fallen into evil seeks to cure it and does not remain implacable. Self-will incurs the charge of folly. Nay yield to the dead, stab not the fallen. What valor is it to slay anew the slain? My thought for you is kind; my words are kind. And to learn from a good counselor is very pleasant, if his counsel brings advantage.

Hereupon Creon angrily and harshly accuses Teiresias of being bribed to frighten him and after an angry altercation Teiresias definitely prophesies calamity for Creon. Now as to Jebb's interpretation. He says (1) that in this speech Teiresias "repre-

sented that Creon might still *be saved* by repentance," (2) that Teiresias' definite prophecy of disaster "assumed that Creon would remain obdurate," (3) that after Creon yielded, if he "had been in time to rescue Antigone" "he would have cancelled both offences"; and then the divine punishment predicted by Teiresias would have been averted. From each of these propositions I dissent. First as to proposition (1). On the basis of Jebb's interpretation, Teiresias in his first speech says to Creon: "If you will now bury Polyneices and release Antigone you will, I think, escape scot free"; or more fully, "although you have already defied heaven by refusing burial to Polyneices, although the body, putrefying under the mid-day heat, has already been mangled by dogs and birds, and the altars of our city have been defiled; although, in defiance of the principles of humanity, you have actually consigned your sister's child to a tomb, there to await the tortures of death by starvation, and this for an act which she felt to be dictated by her highest conception of duty and honor" (and which in the judgment of Sophocles was dictated by the "higher law"; cf. *O.T.* 865 ff.) "you can now escape all unhappy consequences by now, in response to my definite and solemn warning, changing your mind." Two related but separable questions are here involved. (1) Teiresias' opinion or feeling as to the possibility of repentance and escape (this of course ultimately goes back to Sophocles' conception); (2) Sophocles' opinion as to such a possibility, involving also his feeling as to the completeness and correctness of the prophet's knowledge of the future. First as to Teiresias. The impression which I get from the whole dialogue down to Creon's angry reply (vss. 1033 ff.) is this: Teiresias believes that Creon has sinned, and deeply, and that he is going to suffer for it. Even so he has sufficient interest in Creon's moral and material well-being to desire that he shall even now recognize his wrong (*ἀμαρτία*) and undo it so far as he can, and that thereby he shall *so far as is now possible* mitigate the impending punishment. Just how far this is now possible, in other words, what is the irreducible minimum of punishment for Creon, Teiresias does not definitely state. I admit readily that the immediate impression made by Teiresias' words upon a reader or a spectator of the play would probably

be that Creon could gain much by prompt repentance, in particular, that perhaps Antigone may yet be saved. And this, be it noted, is wholly desirable from the point of view of dramatic effectiveness. But a closer examination of the passage to a large degree dispels this impression. (a) As far as we know, Antigone may have been already dead when Teiresias' warning to Creon is being spoken. Since her exit at vs. 943 there has intervened a choral ode, which may doubtless dramatically furnish ample time for such a result. Moreover, there is, I think, a definite indication that Antigone took her life soon after her incarceration. Haemon left the stage at vs. 765, before Antigone's last appearance. Apparently when he reached the tomb he found Antigone already dead; otherwise he would have prevented her act. Does it not seem probable that knowing his father's purpose he would make his way to the tomb as quickly as possible after Antigone had been placed there? If so, the argument is strong that Antigone slew herself soon after being left in the tomb. (b) Note secondly that just 31 verses after the end of Teiresias' first speech (i.e., not over two or three minutes later) Teiresias prophesies plainly condign punishment. What is the reason for this changed tone of Teiresias' speaking? Jebb says, "because Creon was stubborn"; and maintains that he still has the opportunity "to cancel both his offences" and to avert the divine punishment predicted by Teiresias. My interpretation is different. In my view, a presentiment in Teiresias' mind, already strong, that punishment is coming to Creon, is by Creon's stubborn refusal to yield made yet stronger and perhaps more definite. But as for his speaking out so positively now compared with his previous vagueness, the principal immediate cause is Teiresias' rising anger and resentment at the harsh accusations of Creon. In fact, Teiresias tells us so plainly at the end of his second speech, vss. 1084, 1088-90. The case of Teiresias before Oedipus in the *Oedipus Tyrannus* is almost exactly similar. Take also vs. 1060: "You will move me to utter *τάκλινητα* διὰ φρενῶν, secrets in my soul (mind) which ought to be let alone." According to Jebb's interpretation *τάκλινητα* must be secrets which have been lodged in his mind only about a minute. To me these words imply rather secrets which were in his mind at least before he

entered the stage. So much as Teiresias' attitude on the matter of Creon's punishment, so far as it is discoverable from the play.

I pass now to what seems to me the really fundamental question, i.e., what would Sophocles as a writer of tragedies and a student of human life regard as probable under the imagined circumstances. This means, what in Sophocles' judgment would the fundamental laws of morality, ethics, religion, require in such a case. It is of course futile to ask at just what moment by the decree of fate—the gods, necessity—did it become irrevocably fixed that events should take precisely the course which they did take; this is impossible of solution by human beings no less now in the twentieth Christian century than in the fifth century before Christ. But it is *not* futile or absurd to ask this question: In the light of all the facts, was it to Sophocles ethically or morally justifiable, or possible, that one who had sinned as Creon had, should by a change of heart at this time "wash all his sins away"? Such a question involves certain other large questions as to the ethical and religious ideas of fifth-century Athens—much too large for full discussion here. Would not Jebb's interpretation imply the conception of forgiveness by some higher power of positive wrong—forgiveness, moreover, which includes release of the wrongdoer from punishment? There seems to be no warrant for any such conception in fifth-century Athens.¹ According to my idea, to the question which I asked above, the whole spirit of Greek ethics and morals says no. This case apart, is there any such example in Sophocles? The voice of Greek tragedy hereon is resonant and unequivocal. The law of causation in the Greek moral world is not so weak and feeble as that. Often enough we moderns in reading Greek tragedy are vastly impressed with the feeling that the punishment of wrong exceeds, or seems to exceed, the sin (cf. Prometheus, Agamemnon, Orestes, Hippolytus, Antigone), but where in Greek tragedy is a person who is portrayed as a notable violator of moral laws allowed to go free?

Place side by side two pictures: Oedipus the king, a man intrinsically noble, kindly, honest, generous, and sympathetic, for a relatively slight fault, so far as his own moral choice is concerned,

¹ Cf. Fairbanks, *Greek Religion*, pp. 342 ff.

suffers a crushing calamity; Creon, who has violated knowingly and deliberately the most sacred laws of religion and of humanity, only when he is scared by the solemn warning of a seer abandons his purpose, and thereby moves into the sunlight of happiness and prosperity. No, I agree with Symonds (*S.G.P.*, I, 434): "The conviction that what a man sows he will reap and that the world is not ruled by blind chance the Greeks held as securely, at least, as we do."

Now as to Teiresias' feeling upon this question; assuming the correctness of my view of Sophocles' opinion, is it probable that Sophocles would conceive and portray Teiresias the prophet as holding on this matter an opinion materially different from his own? I see no reason either on general *a priori* grounds, or in the words of the play itself to think so. All lines of reasoning point the other way. This then is my answer to Jebb's first proposition, that Teiresias believed and represented in his first speech that Creon could be saved by repentance.

Jebb's second proposition may be dealt with very briefly. He says that Teiresias' definite prophecy of disaster assumed "that Creon would remain obdurate." Jebb gives no evidence whatever of this; there is certainly no such evidence in the play. Moreover, Jebb himself a few lines below directly contradicts this statement. He says: "But the dramatic function of Teiresias obviously requires us to assume that he was infallible whenever he spoke from 'the signs of his art'"; and he very properly refers to vss. 1092 ff.—which follow immediately after Teiresias' prediction—where the coryphaeus says: "We know that since our hair once black has been white he has never yet made a false prophecy to the city." This passage alone makes it entirely probable that Jebb's second proposition is erroneous.

The third proposition as I stated it above was that if Creon had been in time to save Antigone he would have canceled both offenses; and then we must infer that the divine punishment would have been averted. If my arguments already presented as to the first proposition are correct, this statement cannot be accepted.

This brings us to the second general part of Jebb's criticism wherein he points out what he feels to be "a real blemish." Jebb says that "while we are anxious that Antigone should be saved and while every moment is precious," Creon, without any sufficient reason and contrary to what the circumstances would suggest, buries Polyneices and raises a mound before he goes to Antigone. "We are not given any reason for the burial being taken in hand before the release." In the first place, I answer, Jebb's main assumption that "everything depended on Creon being in time to save Antigone" has been shown to be erroneous. The fact of punishment to come was henceforth certain; the suggestion, however, that its actual form *might* have been different, while perhaps true, seems to me not really pertinent nor profitable. But the other question which Jebb raises *is* pertinent, i.e.: Does that which actually happens after Creon's change of mind happen in accordance with the known material and human factors in the situation, or, in the language of Aristotle, "by a probable or necessary sequence"? Jebb says no; he implies that the fatal delay seems to be the result merely of negligence or of caprice. I say that not only is the course of events sufficiently accounted for, but that it could not consistently with the rest of the play have happened otherwise; and that this part of the play testifies clearly to Sophocles' ability firmly to carry a dramatic situation through to its just conclusion, to his subtle and profound insight into human nature, and to his power to portray character with undeviating and relentless consistency.

Some of Jebb's statements in support of his conclusion are, I think, quite incorrect. He says that Creon and his servants after burying Polyneices raised "a high mound," *τύμβον ὀρθόκρανον* (vs. 1203). But *ὀρθός*, so far as I can discover, never means literally "high," but rather (1) upright, as opposed to horizontal, or (2) straight ahead, *rectus*, as opposed to crooked. He says that "in any case the margin for Creon must have been a narrow one." But what necessary reason was there why Antigone should either commit suicide at all, or, if so, should do it very quickly after being immured? Be it noted (1) that the tomb where Antigone was

placed was high enough for her to stand erect in, or nearly so, otherwise she could not have hung herself; and (2) that she had at least a little food, given her that the city might avoid defilement. Notice too that when Antigone left the stage her nerve seemed to be shaken somewhat, in view of which one might perhaps assume that she would not have the self-possession and the decision which are undoubtedly necessary to one who is to take his own life.

But these after all are merely incidental considerations and as such only I reckon them. The really determining factor in the situation is the character of Creon, the portrayal of which in this play I consider to be one of the most skilful to be found in the entire range of dramatic characterization, and which for clearness, consistency, solidity, and truth to a certain type of human nature has rarely been surpassed. And what were the dominant characteristics in his make-up? Creon was a man of a wooden, mechanical type of mind; one who in thought and conduct was guided, not by clear-eyed, self-reliant, discriminating intelligence, but by narrow, mechanical rules-of-thumb. He was almost completely lacking in that invaluable quality, imagination; in the ability to see the other man's point of view, the power of taking into one comprehensive purview varied and conflicting factors in a situation; he could see only one or two things clearly at a time. But within this limited range of vision his power of vigorous concentrated action and of stubborn perseverance was great. Quite in accord with this type of character, he was pious and god-fearing, but in a narrow, uninspired, indiscriminating way; he stood mightily in awe of the powers of heaven when once he thought he knew what those powers were demanding. He was a man who would anxiously tithe mint and cummin, and neglect justice and mercy. As to his emotional nature, Creon was thoroughly hard, rigid, and metallic, and almost completely lacking in warm human sympathy. I think the correctness of this characterization could be fully established from the play as a whole. Is not this precisely the type of man whose action in certain circumstances was likely to be, though narrowly and rigidly logical, yet quite wrong-headed?

As to the course, then, of Creon's action after he changes his mind, you can now see what my answer will be to Jebb's objection.

I heartily agree with him that a fatal delay must not seem to be the result merely of negligence or of caprice; but I emphatically maintain that such is not the case with the events in question. After Teiresias' second speech and the comments of the chorus thereon, Creon is at last convinced that he has flagrantly violated the will of heaven; as a result of this realization he is thoroughly scared. But it is clear from vss. 1095-1106 that his yielding is due, not primarily to any real penitence on his part, not to a "conviction of sin," but to superstitious terror and to the conviction that it is useless to contend against the superior force of necessity (vs. 1106: ἀνάγκη οὐχὶ δυσμαχήμενον). His first thought is to forestall if possible the calamities which were prophesied for his own household, and also, I think, to turn the wrath of the gods away from the state; for with all Creon's narrowness, he is sincerely devoted to the welfare of the state. Let it be observed also that in this emergency Creon's self-possession is somewhat disturbed, his intellectual and moral equilibrium is somewhat impaired, and his action is somewhat hurried and precipitate. On the other hand, nowhere in the whole course of the play does Creon show any real sympathy for Antigone; compare, e.g., the attitude of Creon with that of the chorus. Not one word of sympathy with Antigone does Creon utter either when he sees her on her way to the tomb, or after he returns with the body of Haemon. In view of all these considerations it seems to me to have been entirely in accord with the material and human factors that Creon should act as he did. Especially, too, is this conclusion confirmed if we may imagine that the way to Antigone's tomb would naturally have taken a person near or in sight of the dead body of Polyneices. In that case every dominant element in Creon's character would have driven him to satisfy to the last jot and tittle the external religious demands before he passed on. The play does not indicate definitely the location of Polyneices' burial place and of Antigone's tomb. From certain indications given in the play I regard it as probable that they were not far apart.

Finally, as to the reason which Jebb gives for Creon's delay; he suggests that if Creon had reversed the order of action, i.e., if he had first gone to Antigone's tomb, then to Polyneices, there

would have been an anticlimax in the messenger's speech, "by which its rhetorical impressiveness would have been destroyed." Of course, according to the argument of this paper, the delay is amply explained by the play itself. But even if this were not so, I regard Jebb's suggestion as very weak and wholly unconvincing. In the existing messenger's speech the account of the burial of Polyneices occupies eight verses. Did Jebb seriously think that if the order of events had been reversed, Sophocles did not have sufficient skill so to construct his messenger's report as to meet every dramatic and rhetorical requirement? Or that to avoid such a difficulty Sophocles, who in general shows such scrupulous care for consistency in dramatic detail within the play itself and in characterization, has knowingly in this play violated such consistency? In my judgment such a conclusion could be accepted only for reasons vastly stronger than those which are given by Mr. Jebb.

LATIN OF TOMORROW

BY A. R. WALLIN
Augustana College

There is today no universal agreement as to the importance of Latin as an educational factor. If, as we believe, solutions to many perplexing social and educational problems will in the future be found, it may be that the problem of Latin study will also be solved. In the meantime the answers to the questions whether the study of Latin should be compulsory or whether, according to present methods, Latin should be studied at all, will be determined by the enlightenment and bias of individuals. The present lack of agreement on these vital questions is undoubtedly due mainly to a want of knowledge and perspective on the part of both the defendant and the opponent. The antagonist of Latin study is more intimately acquainted with his own field of work and hence, naturally though unintentionally, magnifies its importance. The defendant, in turn, may think that he correctly appraises the value of his specialty, but it is probable that he also overestimates its importance relative to other subjects. Furthermore, because of his certainty of being correct in his valuation of the classics, he may fail to notice defects in his teaching method and to realize that the actual results obtained are not the results he predicts. Whatever the cause, the problem is still with us and will remain until both sides, with impartial minds, balance the arguments involved.

A solution of the problem cannot, accordingly, be expected from the present attempt to rally the forces on the side of Latin. The prerequisite for a final statement of the value and object of this study is full expression on both sides. An unbiased jury may then some day be able to sift the pros and cons and to arrive at a just verdict. This will be no easy task, for it is possible that there are no final answers to the questions asked, in the sense that the answers will be the same for all men at all times. The answers must

take into consideration the fact that civilization is progressive, or at least evolutionary. The study of a subject in a certain way and for a certain purpose may at one period be highly desirable, while at another period, because of changed conditions, the same method may be harmful and the same object useless or no longer possible.

At one time the purpose of studying Latin was to acquire ability to read the literature of Rome in the original. During the calm that followed the storms of the dark ages, men of Western Europe discovered the riches which lay buried in the literatures of the Greeks and the Romans. A mastery of ancient languages was necessary to make this their own. In a world where no other books existed, the Greek and Latin books which were found in rapid succession became the textbooks of the schools. The natural result was that for years and centuries the ancients furnished, not only the subject-matter to be studied, but also the vehicle for communication and transmission of knowledge.

Is the situation the same today? There are still a few who fail to see that it is vastly different. These few still fondly cherish the survival of other days that the main, if not the sole, purpose of the study of Latin is to learn to read the language. They apparently have not noticed—to use the words of Professor John K. Lord—“that, if the object of studying Latin is to learn to read it, the present study of it fails of its object.”

Do we not have here the crux of all the battles that have been waged regarding the study of the classics? Why not admit that which all know is a fact? How many educated men who have studied Latin four to six years are in later life able to read with ease a page of Livy or an ode of Horace? The percentage is exceedingly small, and would be discouraging to the teacher and taxpayer alike, if they measured the value of Latin study by the graduate's ability to use the language. The American college graduate, not to speak of the high-school graduate, cannot read Latin and would be surprised if one would intimate that a facility in the use of the language should be acquired.

The fact is that a thorough mastery of the Latin language cannot be acquired in four to six years. A whole life is not too long

to devote to this subject. The grammatical structure is, in the first place, totally different from that of the English. It is no easy task for an English-speaking student to gain facility in apprehending thoughts expressed in a highly inflectional language. This is illustrated by the fact that many students, even after they have studied Latin for years, are unable to understand what they read until they have changed the Latin sentences into English by mechanically following grammatical rules. It is through the medium of English that the Latin is understood. The thought of the original is also often obtained in another way with less mental exertion. If a translation is first read in English, the Latin can be read and understood at sight. As a matter of fact, it is not understood at sight, but in this case as in the former the thought is first grasped in English and is afterward transferred to the Latin page. This is as far as the majority of students ever go.

But if the present study of Latin fails to give the student a reading knowledge of the language, the inference is not that because of this it fails of its object. Latin, fortunately, has based, and will continue to base, its defense on benefits derived from its study which are more fundamental. I say this is fortunate, for otherwise Latin teachers would have to admit that they are defenders of a tragic waste of time. It is, of course, also in a way unfortunate that the defense cannot also be based on the language, for if it could, the results could be tested by all. It is the apparent failure of the study of Latin that gives the opponents of the classics the greater part of their ammunition. The assertion that it is a college fetish is not now so often heard as in the eighties. The teacher of the classics of today certainly, not only recognizes the value of the study of other subjects, but is willing to limit within reasonable bounds the time devoted to his own. The field of human knowledge has grown to such an extent that Latin as a language must from now on occupy a smaller place in the curriculum. If time is to be had for the study of science, shopwork, agriculture, music, and other subjects, less time must be spent on the classics. It is not that the importance of the classics has decreased with the advent of new subjects into the curriculum. The immense gain in importance of the sum of all the other subjects has only limited

the time that the ordinary student can devote to this essential study. In short, conditions have today brought about the following situations: (1) not all students can find time for the study of Latin; (2) the main object of the majority of Latin students can no longer be to learn the language.

It has been said that new educational ideals have brought about a change in the types and ideals of students, that the student of today measures efficiency by outward success rather than by culture of the mind. There can be no question that his ideals have changed, and that the practical adaptability of his studies to his future profession has much to do with his choice of courses, but the conclusion does not follow that he at the same time cannot prepare himself for life in a wider sense. Of course, complete adjustment to the whole of our complex civilization is impossible to any one individual, and therefore it seems right that a student should select his cultural studies from those fields which he by nature is best fitted to master, and which will better fit him for the wider life that will be his. In the case of one student the major attention will be given to science, in the case of another perhaps to the classics. The points of view of the two men in later life will, without question, be different, but it is meaningless to say that either has received a superior education. As a matter of fact, neither has been completely adjusted to modern life. Ability to understand men must be combined with ability to understand things, if the purpose is to understand the civilization of today. If time and individual inclination permitted, the ideal preparation for life would be gained by a thorough study of science and the humanities.

One reason why it appears that the classics are held in less esteem than formerly is that the number of advanced students has immensely increased. Thousands of young men and women, whose task in life will be to fill positions in the business world and the trades, receive today the benefit of a high-school or college education, while the percentage of the total population which pursues studies for merely literary culture, remains nearly the same as when education was not accessible to all. If the classics form an admirable training for these few, it is not more than right that another course of training should be provided for business men and

tradesmen, which will make them more efficient in their especial spheres than was possible before systematic study for these vocations was introduced. The lack of interest in the classics is therefore more apparent than real. The fault lies largely with those teachers of the classics who insist that also this host of new students must receive a training similar to that of the elect few of a generation or two ago. A large number of high-school and college students will continue the study of the language of the Romans, and more particularly of their other contributions to our civilization. A smaller, but sufficiently large, number will specialize in this field and will gain a mastery of the language. These will, as the case is now, be leaders in the realms of thought and literature. In the realms of material comfort and progress there will be other leaders, whose studies have been mainly in other lines.

Furthermore, the chief and sole purpose of the study of Latin by the majority of students in the high school of the future will not be to acquire a reading knowledge of the language. It should here be observed that the phrase, "the study of Latin," is a misnomer. The study will comprise much more than the study of the language. The whole civilization of the ancients will be studied. The place of the Romans in history—and why not of the Greeks as well?—their contribution to language, literature, law, art, commerce, and science of today can well be made the subject-matter of the four years of classical work. It is true that a thorough and intimate knowledge and understanding of these subjects can be acquired only by a first-hand acquaintance with the sources, but it is without question possible through the medium of English to gain a more systematic knowledge of them than that which is gained at present. It is the task of the university to ferret out from ancient authors the true story of the life and thought of ancient times. The university has done and does this, its allotted task, well, though large portions of the story, it must be confessed, lie buried in dissertations accessible to, and read only by, advanced students. Certainly it should not be necessary for generation after generation of high-school students to do this work over and over, when so much work remains undone which would lead to the acquisition of systematic knowledge and would be equally fruitful in forming

such mental habits as can be transferred and applied to life-problems.

The purpose of all education is to train men and women to become socially efficient. He who is better fitted than another to fill the place in society into which his lot is cast may be said to be the better educated. This does not mean that the man who comes out at the top in the political and financial struggle is more highly educated than his fellows. Personal efficiency, so widely preached in our day, is often incompatible with social efficiency. Individual success is often achieved by tramping others under foot. Every educational plan must therefore aim at more than individual aggrandizement. It must, of course, prepare the individual for high efficiency in his life-work, but it must also aim at physical well-being, individual contentment, and a moral improvement, which results in an identification of the interests of others with his own.

Each period in the history of the world has had its own ideals. He who understands these best and who is trained to act in accordance with them, is best fitted for association with his fellows. Each individual as a factor in modern co-operative society should to some extent understand the whole mechanism of society and know what others are doing as well as the part he plays in the whole. It is not enough that he be made an expert in his own life-calling, so that he knows how to operate well the lever which is assigned to him. Man should not be a mere automaton. The courses which a student takes, aside from those which are to prepare him for his life-work, should have the object in view of helping him as a social being. The student should acquire a perspective of modern society, its composition and operation, its creations, material, mental, and moral. To do this it will be found that he cannot limit himself to his own time and people. The present must be understood in the light of the past. The contributions of peoples who have lived before us and the impulses which one generation has given to the following have made modern society what it is. Mistakes have been committed and corrected along the way. These should be noticed, so that we do not through ignorance pay a penalty for action which can be avoided.

This acquired outlook on the past and the present will furthermore become a source of contentment and happiness. The mere casual acquaintance with chemistry, for instance—to take an illustration from another field—gives a man abundant pleasure, though his major interests may be centered elsewhere. He reads with interest of the discoveries in this science. Because he feels somewhat at home in this field, he may even be led to widen his knowledge, while he passes by as something foreign an article on meteorology, which he has not studied. The fact that a man cannot become an expert in all fields is no reason why he should limit himself to one. A wide knowledge of the world, if combined with expert knowledge of one's own field is not dilettantism, but adjustment.

It is in view of this statement of the purpose of education that the value of the study of Latin must be estimated. It is evident that neither this nor any other subject has any justification for inclusion in a non-professional curriculum, if it does not add its mite toward the realization of a better social being and a happier and better individual. Any study is, of course, justifiable, if its purpose is personal efficiency in one's life-work, but there is clearly no purpose in studying anything outside of this, unless it will in some way or other be of definite service for life in a broader sense.

It is my conviction that the mere study of the Latin language for a few years is of great educational value to the student, even if he does not gain facility in reading it. Although better results will in the future be attained by a change in the methods of teaching and in the subject-matter of classic study, it is nevertheless certain that the results attained today are of high value to the student who is equipped for successful work in the Latin classroom. The faithful high-school graduate who has studied Latin for four years has at least gained a wider knowledge of his own language. The daily translation of Latin into his own language necessarily compels him to add to his vocabulary, to discriminate between the value of words, and logically to construct sentences which express thoughts which are new to him. He not only acquires a fluency in the handling of language, but also makes the new thoughts which he handles his own. Furthermore, if his mother-tongue, as

in the case of English, is etymologically closely related to the Latin his insight into the meaning of words becomes deeper, and his use of them more accurate.

It has often been questioned whether the acquaintance that the student gains of the author's thought through a study of the original is better than that gained through the reading of a translation. Alexander Baine, in his "Education as a Science," asserted "that the literary interest in the authors is not felt for want of due preparation." Because the student must use up so much mental effort in getting the meaning of the language, he loses his interest, and "literature is nothing if not interesting." In this there is undoubtedly some truth. The niceties of diction are certainly missed to a great extent by the high-school student of Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil, but I nevertheless hold that his acquaintance with Latin literature differs in several respects very widely from that of a man who has read only a translation. Whether he will or not, and whether he at the time is aware of it or not, there is thrust upon the student, as days go by, an insight into the Roman mind and literature which one unacquainted with the language never gains. The very fact that the student cannot read speedily is in itself of value. Because of this he is forced to observe more closely the language and the thought it expresses. He who has read through works of the ancients only in a translation may have a more complete knowledge of the message which the author wishes to transmit, but he has not the intimate acquaintance with the writer which the slow reader of the original gains.

Other gains made from Latin as now studied are many and of practical value in life. Habit of logical thinking and accuracy of expression in the vernacular are acquired, inasmuch as the facts learned and the procedure followed are to a large extent identical in Latin and English. The classicist does not believe that training in Latin may by transfer be utilized in building a bridge, but he holds that the intense application necessary for success in the Latin classroom compels the student to acquire habits of observation, of attention, and of persistence in innumerable situations in life which in their elements and processes are closely akin to the situations in the Latin classroom.

The student acquires under an able teacher also a certain amount of historical information, some knowledge of literature in its various forms, an acquaintance with conditions and problems of ancient times, and is therefore by comparison able to form a truer estimate of the degree of similarity between his own civilization and that of the past. A broader human sympathy is thereby engendered, for the better we learn to know peoples of other times and climes, the better we understand that men wherever and whenever found are very much alike. To learn that we all have the same virtues and vices, that we are buoyed up by the same hopes and aspirations, and saddened by the same griefs is in itself a lesson in adjustment.

In short, my conviction is that Latin as studied today produces results which are of value for life. Not all, as was stated, should study Latin. Some have not the native ability necessary to acquire benefits commensurate with the time spent. Others whose interests and genius lie in other directions cannot afford to spend their time on Latin. Still, all men of idealistic and analytic minds do now, as in the past, receive a training through this subject, as through no other, which adjusts them to those high positions in life which can be filled only by men of clear thinking and high ideals.

Although this is true of Latin as it is now taught, still there are many who believe that better results may be gained in the future. I need only emphasize the reasons already offered for this belief and repeat what, in my opinion, the Latin course of the future should comprise.

The immediate object of education is adjustment, but beyond this there is an ulterior purpose. It is not enough that the individual so adjust himself that he may live in the world with the least friction. He must learn to take a step in advance. For mere existence without friction an automaton with the right reactions need only be created. But to take a step forward it is imperative that the individual know the reasons for the reactions. He must know what has made the world what it is, what errors of the human race have been eliminated and why. He must, in other words, through the study of the records of mankind learn to avoid a repetition of the mistakes of the past. To take a step in the right direction, which is equivalent to a step in the direction of progress, a

man must be abreast of his time. This he cannot be until he has mastered the past. If modern civilization is a lineal descendant of the ancient, and if the study of one phase of the latter is of importance toward the adjustment of one class of students, it seems evident that the more embracing the courses in the classics are made and the better they are fitted to the needs of different students, the better will they serve their purpose. They will be more likely to produce that social and individual efficiency which makes for progress in the arts, for perfection of our social organization, and for greater individual contentment.

The Latin classroom often lays so much stress on language, in its endeavor to teach a reading knowledge of Latin, that other vital things are forgotten. When once we dare to depart from the conventional mode of imparting instruction, a new era, more rich in results, will be ushered in. Signs of its advent already appear. The secondary school, on the one hand, has raised its voice in response to the new conditions, and demands greater freedom in mapping out the work in the classics. The colleges have also responded by permitting a greater latitude to those who offer Latin for admission. These responses must be considered tentative steps in a process of adjustment, which will continue until this study most effectively plays its part in the education of youth. It is conceivable that instead of spending four years on the study of the Latin language alone, the student of the future will devote a considerable part of this time to the study of the art and literature, of the private and public life of the Romans, of all phases of their civilization. The study of the language will receive its share of attention, but the purely linguistic course will be offered only to those who are especially fitted for the study of language, and whose vocation in life will be within the realms of thought and expression.

The purpose of this paper was not to outline an ideal schedule in detail, but merely to suggest changes, which, in the writer's opinion, should be made. Several tentative plans of work, more or less akin to the foregoing suggestions, have here and there been followed. Since results have not been measured, it is, of course, impossible for anyone to say to what extent the new teaching of

the classics has better served as a preparation for life. Until we can accurately measure results we must be guided in the outlining of courses by a priori reasoning. There can, however, be no question that these new plans of work have inspired a greater interest in the subject in the schools where they have been tried. It is not only the intrinsic difficulty of the Latin language which deters many from selecting it. The reason is rather to be found in their inability to see that a sacrifice of four years to monotony will bring them a recompense worth the price. As a matter of fact, in many instances no worthy recompense is received, for interest in a subject is a prerequisite to its mastery and the resulting training. The study of the classics in the future should be so planned that they offer training to students differently equipped, and the work should be so planned that it demands thoroughness and inspires the necessary interest for its mastery. Aside from making Latin a more valuable educational factor, this would result in the additional gain that more would accept the reasons offered for its study. Many are opponents of Latin because they cannot see what use there is in studying this subject, when the end advanced by its sponsors is not as a rule attained. If the study of Latin is made a study of Roman antiquity in the largest sense, both student and parent will recognize its importance and the validity of the demand that it hold a prominent place in the curriculum of the secondary school.

Current Events

[Edited by Clarence W. Gleason, Roxbury Latin School, Boston, Mass., for the territory covered by the Association of New England and the Atlantic States; Daniel W. Lothman, East High School, Cleveland, Ohio, for the Middle States, west to the Mississippi River; Walter Miller, the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., for the Southern States; and by Frederick C. Eastman, the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, for the territory of the Association west of the Mississippi, exclusive of Louisiana and Texas. News from the Pacific Coast may be sent to Miss Juliann A. Roller, Franklin High School, Portland, Ore., and to Miss Bertha Green, Hollywood High School, Los Angeles, Cal. This department will present everything that is properly news—occurrences from month to month, meetings, changes in faculties, performances of various kinds, etc. All news items should be sent to the associate editors named above.]

California

Hollywood.—The Latin play presented at the Hollywood High School on March 1 and 2 was an unprecedented success and showed, more vividly than by words, not only the value, but also the appreciation of a classical training. On both days of the production the auditorium was crowded and many were refused tickets. More than forty schools were represented in the audience, and some of the spectators had traveled two hundred and fifty miles in order to be present.

The play chosen was Miller's *Dido, the Phoenician Queen*, which had been translated back into Latin by the students of the Virgil class. The "Hymn to the Dawn" was exceptionally well done and deserves especial commendation. This translation work was of the utmost educational value to the students and served to interest, not only those who took part, but also the whole senior class.

Under the very efficient direction of Miss Bertha Green, head of the Latin department, rehearsals were many and thorough. Daily practice was maintained for two months, and the marked excellence of the actors in enunciation of the words and in familiarity with the lines astonished even classical teachers, proving beyond question that Latin is a living language. It caused a heart-throb to feel the tremendous force of the Latin in Dido's denunciation of Aeneas (Act III), while the sarcasm of Juno and the quick wit of Venus (Act II) were by no means portrayed in a "dead" tongue!

The prologue in English was beautifully rendered by a Roman maiden, who presented the outline of the play and also explained some of the Phoenician customs. This was followed by a chorus of Romans, who sang the well-known "Arma virumque cano," and then the play began with the "Invocation to the Dawn" sung by the Carthaginian chorus.

Special mention should be made of the "Forest Scene," which opened with a graceful dance of woodland nymphs. The hunting was interrupted by a

realistic thunderstorm—a real eastern storm, with nothing Californian about it! Small wonder that the western boys and girls, now Roman and Carthaginian nobles, were thoroughly frightened and rushed hither and yon, little disguised Cupid being rescued by Dido's page, and Dido herself being rushed by Aeneas to the shelter of a cave.

In the banquet scene there was given a beautiful "Dance of the Lyres," which was thoroughly in harmony with the spirit of the play and added much to the scene itself. An interlude was added between Acts III and IV in the form of a Vestal Virgin Drill. This was particularly artistic, and it served as a most appropriate introduction to the loneliness and tragic sadness of Dido in the following scene.

In the last act the *Aeneid* was followed more closely than in Professor Miller's play; for Iris, as messenger of Juno, was introduced to free the soul of the dying queen, and in her rainbow robe she lent a spiritual beauty to the tragedy as a whole.

The leading parts were played by students who were on the honor roll and who maintained their standing during all the weeks of rehearsal. The thorough mastery of the long lines (which were read throughout with no prompting) and the skilful interpretation of the various characters displayed real scholarship and were in themselves a vital argument for the rich value of a Latin training.

Illinois

Chicago.—The twenty-ninth Educational Conference of the Academies and High Schools in Relations with the University of Chicago was held at the University on April 12 and 13. The general topic of the conference was "The Junior College and the Junior High School." Departmental sections discussed this topic from the standpoint of the several departments. The Greek and Latin section was well attended, with Mr. J. O. Lofberg, of the Oak Park High School, presiding. The papers, which were unusually informing and stimulating, were as follows: "Non-essentials in First- and Second-Year Latin," by Miss Ada Townsend, Evanston Academy; "Greek and Latin in the Junior College," by Mrs. Laurie Frazeur, Nicholas Senn High School; "Latin in the Junior High School," by Miss Anna S. Jones, Central High School, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Massachusetts

The New England Classical Association met at Amherst, on the thirtieth of last March. The sessions, which filled both Friday and Saturday, were held in the Latin room of Amherst College, a meeting-place, not only commodious and comfortable, but singularly attractive and interesting because of its fine pictures and collections of bronzes, models, and casts. In the late afternoon of Friday, President and Mrs. Meiklejohn gave an informal and thoroughly enjoyable tea, and this was followed by a six o'clock dinner, at which more than

a hundred members of the association were the guests of the college. That evening the Amherst Players presented the *Philoctetes* of Sophocles, in a translation by Professor H. deForest Smith. The entire presentation was eminently creditable and so well done as obviously to affect the audience. The interest was held from first to last, and it is not an exaggeration to call it intense at more than one place. The parts of Philoctetes and Neoptolemus, taken by Winfield William Riefler and Henry Willis Wells, respectively, were especially effective. The feeling of the audience during the play was too real to express itself in applause, which came, however, in a great outburst after the curtain fell.

Two substitutions in the published program were made. On account of the illness of Mr. Husband, the time allotted to his paper was filled by Professor C. E. Bennett, of Amherst, who read by request his own verse translations of several odes of Horace, a few of the poems of Catullus, and of the *Pervigilium Veneris*, done in the original meter. "Soon shall love who knows not loving, who hath loved shall love again," was his refrain. It is much to be hoped that his translations will soon be published, as they are decidedly good. Professor Clifford H. Moore, of Harvard, read the paper prepared by Professor Howard. One unusual feature was the address of welcome by President Meiklejohn. So far was it from being commonplace and trite that it stood out as a really significant part of the program. "The business of a college, as I conceive it," said he, "is twofold: first, to make us sensitive to life, i.e., to cultivate taste; secondly, to make young men and women powerful and intelligent to gratify this taste when acquired." "A Fourth Century Man of Letters" was a delightful essay on Ausonius. Perhaps the most enthusiastic reception was accorded to Professor Forbes's paper, "Fallacies in the Argument for the Modern School," a brilliant and convincing reply to Mr. Flexner's *A Model School*. "The General Education Board owes an apology for publishing as expert literature such misleading statistics." "'Language in itself,' says Mr. Flexner, 'has no value.' Have the telephone and telegraph then any value? Language is the instrument of our whole intellectual existence." "Life is a continual struggle with required subjects. The world does not ask, What do you like? but, Can you do this?"

Following the reading of this paper, a committee was appointed to protest to the General Education Board against such a misuse of statistics, and to provide for the publication and circulation of Mr. Forbes's paper in pamphlet form. At an earlier business session two other committees had been appointed to co-operate with the Classical Association of the Middle West and South—one to collect material with a view to improving the teaching of Latin throughout the country, and the other "in search of allies from other branches of learning." As there is an increasing surplus accumulating in the treasury, it was voted to establish a loan collection of slides, coins, models, and casts for the use of members of the Association, and to arrange for the exchange of lecturers and lecture materials among the colleges and high schools of New

England. The expenditure of not more than \$300 for this purpose was authorized during the coming year. The following officers were elected for the ensuing year: President, Mr. J. Edmund Barss, Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Connecticut; Vice-President, Professor Julia H. Caverno, Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts; Secretary-Treasurer, Professor George E. Howes, Williams College, Williamstown, Massachusetts; members of the Executive Committee (to serve for two years): Professor Paul Nixon, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine, and Professor Samuel E. Bassett, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont. The other members of the Executive Committee are Miss Irene Nye, Connecticut College for Women, New London, and Mr. Walter V. McDuffee, Central High School, Springfield, Massachusetts.

On the whole the meeting was well arranged, well attended, interesting, and successful. [Reported by MISS IRENE NYE.]

Michigan

Howell.—On April 6 the Latin department of the Howell High School presented a "Roman Festival." The program was of a miscellaneous nature, the chief features being songs by a chorus of Roman maidens, *A School Boy's Dream*, *Pyramus and Thisbe* adapted from *Decem Fabulae*, and the beautiful Vestal Virgin Drill.

The evening's entertainment was enjoyed by a large and appreciative audience and was financially successful. With the proceeds a picture for the Latin room, "Cicero Addressing the Senate," will be purchased. This was a first attempt on the part of both students and teacher; the splendid spirit of helpfulness and co-operation of the school as a whole was worth all of our efforts.

New Jersey

Princeton University.—While the program for the conference on the value of classical studies to be held at Princeton University on Saturday, June 2, is not yet ready for publication, the preliminary arrangements are being rapidly completed. The addresses will be delivered by men of eminence in fields outside of classical studies. Among the speakers already secured are Henry Cabot Lodge, representing history and public life; Dr. Llewellys Barker, of the Johns Hopkins University, and Dean Vaughn, of the University of Michigan, representing medicine; Dean Pound, of the Harvard Law School, representing law; the editor of the *New York Times* and the editor of the *New York Sun*, representing journalism; Mr. Fairfax Harrison, president of the Southern Railway, and Mr. Alba Johnson, president of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, representing business.

New York

The direct-method demonstration by the New York Latin Club.—At the meeting of the Classical Forum of the New York Latin Club, held March 10 at

Hunter College, New York City, three demonstrations of the direct method were given before an audience of more than 150.

Dr. Edward C. Chickering, of Jamaica High School, New York City, chairman of the Forum, opened the meeting by defining the character and aim of the direct method as differentiated from the distinctively oral, inductive, natural, and conversational methods. The cardinal principles of the direct method are the association of the thing or the act with the Latin word, without the interposition of the English, and the understanding of the Latin sentence without the medium of translation. Its object is first to habituate the pupils to regard and use Latin as a living language, a normal and natural medium of conveying ideas. Once Latin is understood as Latin, translation becomes a valuable exercise, but not before, owing to the extreme differences in idiom and word-usage between the two languages.

To illustrate these principles three classes were conducted before the audience, one of beginners, one of pupils in the middle of their course, and one of pupils shortly to enter college, each class having thirty minutes for its work.

The first class was conducted by Mr. Pincus Hirshcopf, of the Speyer School, a junior high school maintained jointly by Teachers College, Columbia University, and the Department of Education of New York City. The twelve boys in this demonstration had studied Latin one year, with three recitations a week, and averaged thirteen years of age. The recitation presented a systematic conspectus of their first year's work and took the form of a rapid fire of questions and answers, illustrating the pupils' thorough familiarity with case usages and inflections in all declensions, including the pronouns; also with the present and perfect active indicative forms and the obliqua in all conjugations, including *sum* and *possum*. The pupils' accuracy, quickness, and enthusiasm were a delight to see.

The second class was made up of twelve fourth-term high-school boys and girls from Jamaica High School, led by Dr. Harwood Hoadley. After presenting the declension of nouns, adjectives, and pronouns, in sentences, and an analogous form of sentence commutation in various tenses, active and passive, in recta and obliqua, the teacher illustrated the method of handling participles and indirect questions by restating them in other forms. He then set forth the procedure used in explaining a new construction—in this case the purpose clause with *ut* and *ne*—building on the pupils' knowledge of the subjunctive forms and usages already learned. A third part of this demonstration illustrated what is the most important exercise of direct-method work after a continuous text has been begun—namely, the retelling by the pupils in their own words of the narrative they have read. Like all the other work shown, this feature was distinctly not prepared for the occasion; the pupils prefer not to memorize the stories, but to rely on their own power in using the language. The telling of the story selected was extremely well done, four pupils taking up the thread one after another.

A class of six girls from the Alcuin Preparatory School was then conducted by Miss Theodora E. Wye. They had had Latin two years and a half, having passed their College Entrance Examination Board examinations in Cicero at the end of the second year. The work showed the method of attack on a new passage in Vergil, in this case Book vi, vss. 124 ff. The girls first read the passage aloud, sentence by sentence, and then plied their teacher with an avalanche of questions, all, of course, in Latin, and answered in Latin, until the meaning of the passage was clear. Finally, one after another, they translated the passage into most creditable English, showing excellent choice of words, and, it need hardly be said, no jargon. This, which presented the final stage of the direct-method work, was naturally the part of the demonstration to clinch the argument. It established the capacity of this method to give pupils a thorough mastery of the thought of the Latin through the medium of Latin. Their translation then was a natural and comparatively easy rendering, into the best English at their command, of ideas already clearly grasped in their Latin dress.

Altogether the demonstration gave an excellent synoptic view of the scope and practice of the direct method. Moreover, the fluency and ease with which both teachers and pupils handled the Latin language, and the alertness and enjoyment manifested by the classes, displayed, not merely the working possibilities of the direct method, but also that live interest which is one of its strongest allies.

The demonstrations were most favorably received by the audience—an audience which by its size showed how living an interest there is in the method in New York City and environs. It is to Dr. Chickering that the chief credit is due for the interesting and illuminating program presented. He has given great impetus in this country to the direct method, standing firmly by his convictions and venturing, even against great odds, to put this method into operation in large high-school classes. The result has been that the direct method has proved itself, not only feasible, but in many respects distinctly the superior of the conventional.

General Comment

[Edited by Gilbert Campbell Scoggin, The University of Missouri.]

Professor Charles C. Mierow, of the department of classical languages and literatures in Colorado College, is preparing a translation of the *Chronicon* of Otto of Freising for Professor Shotwell's *Records of Civilization*.

The British war office has appointed a special committee whose duty is the arranging of a series of lectures for soldiers at the front. Courses in biology, English literature, and history have been provided, the lectures being given in the Y.M.C.A. huts close to the firing line. Professor Gilbert Murray, of Oxford, has been made chairman of this committee.

In a recent issue of the *Bulletin* of the John Rylands Library of Manchester, the librarian of the University of Louvain, Monsieur Delannoy, is quoted as saying that when his library was destroyed by the Germans at the beginning of the war, at least one thousand manuscripts, dating from the eleventh to the fifteenth century, were lost. At the same time a very great collection of incunabula, together with the archives of the university, was burned; and from the débris not a single leaf was recovered.

The Latin department of the Kirksville Normal School of Missouri is prepared to send out the following lantern slides to schools in the state: (1) "Art of War at Caesar's Time"; (2) "The Gallic War"; (3) "Stories from Ovid"; (4) "Vergil"; (5) "A Roman School"; (6) "Dress, Games, Theaters"; (7) "Views in Rome"; (8) "Views in Pompeii"; (9) "Writing Materials." Those interested should write to Professor T. Jennie Green, at Kirksville. In the school's *Bulletin* for November, 1916, Miss Green discusses "Latin below the Ninth Grade."

Among the *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, issued in January, may be found the first instalment of Mr. Aksel G. S. Josephson's study in "The Literature of the Invention of Printing." Twenty-seven books printed in the fifteenth century are here described, in each of which some reference is made to the invention of printing by movable types. Certainly no group of men has been more benefited by this glorious invention than the classical scholars themselves, and some knowledge of its origin and development is desired by any educated person. To the uninitiated it may at first sight seem extraordinary that the exact date of such a remarkable invention

is unknown. The dates recorded by contemporaries range from 1440 to 1457 as indicated in the volumes noted by Mr. Josephson. Germany is generally given as the place of invention, which is often localized at Mainz. Gutenberg is generally named as the inventor, but we find the names also of Fust, Schoeffer, Mentelin, and Jenson competing. The *Cologne Chronicle* in 1499 first introduces the Dutch claim, asserting that the Mainz invention was directly based on a Dutch process for printing Donatases. As is well known, the Dutch advocates connect the invention with Lourens Janzoon Coster, of Haarlem. The Germans, however, have the obvious advantage in that they can confront the inquirer with books actually printed by Gutenberg at Mainz, while the Costerians are forced to fall back upon very strong circumstantial evidence. This evidence will be found marshaled in very formidable shape by Mr. J. H. Hessels in the new *Encyclopaedia Britannica* under "Typography." The probable truth of the matter is that block printing had been developed in several quarters simultaneously to a point where the simple step to printing by movable types would suggest itself to printers in different places. Such a thing is common enough in the scientific world. Whoever it was that took the magic step must always be awarded a place of high honor along with that "Cadmus" of old who conferred the alphabet upon Greece and all succeeding civilized nations.

At a meeting of the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, held on November 14, 1916, there was a general discussion of the question of "The Future of Hellenic Studies." Mr. Walter Leaf, the president of the Society, pointed out that all studies were now being critically tested, Greek along with the rest. Materialistic science is being exalted above all else, and science itself is suffering through a restricted interpretation of its meaning. In discussing the position of Greek in future education, he argued strongly against compulsory Greek. He is at one with President Eliot in opposing all artificial props. He thinks that the compulsory study of Greek is turning out every year many bitter enemies of Greek, even among students who must be placed among the most intelligent. He cites the testimony of Lord Rayleigh, Henry Sidgwick, and F. W. Maitland as supporting this view. He points out that science has rapidly advanced in spite of compulsory Greek, and he thinks that this advance of science has not in the least retarded the progress of Greek and Latin, this being proved by the output of scholarly work which is far above that of half a century ago. Judged as a science should be judged, by the results of its research, the position of the classics was never stronger. He spoke feelingly of what the value of Greek had been in his own experience. "I find it difficult to imagine what I should have been without Greek; to me it has meant the very light of my life." The next speaker, Mr. T. E. Page, struck a very pessimistic note, insisting that Greek was rapidly dying in the public schools, and that its life was being prolonged only by the encouragement

which came to it from the older universities, this encouragement largely taking the form of compulsion. He seems to favor retaining Greek as a compulsory subject. Sir Clifford Allbutt supported Mr. Leaf against compulsory Greek at the universities. He thinks that both Greek and Latin should be taught as living tongues. As to the common division of studies into two rival camps, he says:

As regards the relations of science to letters I will say only that these arts are not to be regarded as rivals, nor even as alternatives; nor again as semidetached; nay, nor even complementary, as some have put it; they are to be regarded as interpenetrating and fusing the one into the other, so that neither is complete without the other. The unlettered scientist and the unscientific student of letters are alike illuminated on one hemisphere only.

He thinks that in our classical periodicals too much space is given to the discussion of "academic conundrums and textual ingenuities," and that more attention should be given to broad cultural phases. In reply to all this it must be admitted that it is no easy task to steer clearly between the Scylla of pedantry and the Charybdis of dilettantism. But it may be repeated that herein the scholar may show his greatness. I suppose that at the present time the journal of no learned American society is more technical than that of the American Oriental Society, yet no articles of greater value or of wider interest have ever been published in it than those of William Dwight Whitney, one of America's greatest specialists. The next speaker was Professor R. S. Conway, who maintained that the proper course was a campaign against "the real enemy, the indifference of English people as a whole to any kind of knowledge." He advised the abolition of Greek as a compulsory subject for students of natural science, even at Oxford and Cambridge. Professor Percy Gardner agreed with Mr. Leaf, but he insisted that an appreciation of Greek values was not bound up in a knowledge of the language. He finds that science and the modern languages are no better off than Greek in the schools. In the case of Greek, specialists are continually being produced and at the same time popular audiences are being attracted by the charm of Greek culture. He highly approves of the purpose of the Loeb Classical Library; "and I do think that in future we shall have to depend for the general diffusion of Hellenic culture more upon translations than upon the originals." Sir William Ramsay spoke of the British contempt for knowledge, which he connects "largely with the failure to learn classics." For a moment he turns devil's advocate and pronounces heresy smacking strongly of Flexnerism, in that he believes that failure in Greek has led students to rest content with mistakes elsewhere. "The most important lesson that one has to learn in this world is that it is not allowable to make a mistake, and we send boys away from school who have to begin to learn when they go into business that the man who makes mistakes has no career before him." He felt that in many instances excellence in classics was joined "with a certain archaic bent of mind which makes a

man useless in practical life." Here the ghost of Gladstone rises before us. Mr. R. W. Livingstone maintained that compared with their position a hundred years ago, classics now are worse off. At that time those who ruled the destinies of the nation were all classically trained. He made the shrewd observation that after the industrial revolution "the classics like the church, have never got hold of the classes which it called into existence." Cobden is quoted as saying that more useful information was contained in one page of the *Times* than in the whole of Thucydides. Here one thinks of Dr. Arnold and his beloved Thucydides. But it is true that many men in public life now come from a class without traditions. Mr. Livingstone is convinced that Greek cannot maintain itself, and is a very strong advocate of its compulsory study. "Without protection, as far as the evidence shows, Greek sinks from an influence molding the educated men of a nation into a study for the few." In a written communication Sir Frederic Kenyon urged a broader foundation for the schoolboy "in classics, mathematics, history, modern languages, and natural science." Specialization should come rather late and then in the field for which the student is best adapted. Every boy should have a chance to show his linguistic ability and Greek should be materially encouraged by scholarships. The admirers of science should get new ones established in their field and should not attempt to divert and appropriate those of other fields. The schools should give more science and the universities should see to it that the scientific students get a proper share of the humanities. These interesting discussions, which should be widely read, may be found given in detail in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XXXVI, Part II, 1916, issued January, 1917.

Book Reviews

Museum of Fine Arts, Boston: Catalogue of Arretine Pottery. By GEORGE H. CHASE, PH. D. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1916. Pp. 112. Pls. xxx. \$2.50 net.

Among the minor products of ancient Roman civilization there is none more interesting and agreeable than the red glazed earthenware which was manufactured at Arretium, the modern Arezzo, from the age of Augustus to that of Claudius inclusive. Decorated as it is with designs in relief, somewhat after the fashion of modern Wedgwood ware, it supplied a cheap substitute for the silver bowls and cups, which only persons of means could afford. No survey of Roman art is complete which fails to include the dainty wreaths and graceful figures of Arretine pottery.

The present volume follows, after an interval of eight years, the same author's catalogue of *The Loeb Collection of Arretine Pottery*. The two books are similar in form and appearance, and the two Introductions are in part identical. The Loeb collection includes about four times as many pieces as are in the Boston museum and their quality is at least as high. On the other hand the new volume has the advantage of profiting by recent studies in this field. Both works are characterized by Professor Chase's habitual precision, thoroughness, and good taste.

F. B. T.

The Year's Work in Classical Studies, 1915. Edited by CYRIL BAILEY. London: John Murray, 1916. Pp. xii+142. 2s.6d.

The publication of this volume, which is the tenth of its series, has been much delayed by war conditions, which have caused also the omission of certain chapters planned by the editor (on Roman Britain, Greek and Latin paleography, New Testament, Greek archaeology and excavation, sculpture and the minor arts). But there yet remain fourteen categories, which furnish forth a book that is not meager in content nor in quality. The eminent names of the contributors of the individual chapters form an imposing galaxy of English (or rather, British) classical scholarship. We must be permitted to join with our transatlantic colleagues in lamenting the death on ill-fated Gallipoli of Mr. G. L. Cheesman, who for several years past has been the reporter for Latin inscriptions.

The much-decreased output of classical publications during the year 1915 has not been without some benefit for this book, since it has permitted certain of the articles to assume the character of reviews rather than of mere classified

lists of titles. It is somewhat amusing to read the dithyrambic welcome extended by Miss Jane E. Harrison to a new American Homeric *χρῆλον*, in view of the brief but effective manner in which Professor John A. Scott, of Northwestern, has already in this *Journal* (XII, 145 f., 478 f.) pricked that particular iridescent bubble. And the present writer may be pardoned for the satisfaction with which he notes the approval by Mr. W. Warde Fowler of his own criticism of Miss Harrison's notions concerning the execution of a Vestal as a form of ritual marriage. In Mr. Fowler's article the concluding quotation mark should be moved from p. 85, l. 3, to the end of l. 5.

The purpose of this note is to call the attention of the many more or less isolated readers of this *Journal* to the great value to them of this annual publication of the (English) Classical Association. With the present volume the editorship of the *Year's Work* passes into the hands of Mr. Stephen Gaselee, fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge.

E. T. M.

Syria as a Roman Province. With a map and plate of coins.

By E. S. BOUCHIER. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1916. Pp. 304. 6s. or \$2.00.

This is the third book Mr. Bouchier has written on Roman provinces. In the other two, those on Spain and Africa, the account was very brief, so much so that they merely aroused the reader's interest without entirely satisfying it. In this book, *Syria as a Roman Province*, that defect has been remedied, for there is much more information and a wider range of subjects. Within the limits of three hundred pages the author finds space to describe the geography and native peoples of Syria and Phoenicia, the important towns together with an account of the life and manners of the people, their trade, literature, religion, architecture, and art. There is a brief sketch of the political history of the province from Seleucid times down through the Byzantine period, with emphasis on the Syrian dynasty at Rome; but the bulk of the book is concerned with the life of the people and the antiquities to be found in Syria. The parts of especial interest are those describing Antioch and Berytus; the trade and emigration of Syrian merchants.

The general impression left by the book is that Syria had an independent character in art, literature, and religion which was retained throughout her history. Roman influence in Syria was very slight, but on the other hand Rome and the West were influenced very strongly by Syria in literature, trade, and religion. Syria, through its famous law school at Berytus, gave Rome her greatest jurists.

The author has drawn his information from coins, inscriptions, archaeological discoveries, as well as literary accounts, both Christian and non-Christian. References to some of these sources are found in the footnotes, but even more would be welcome. A brief bibliography is appended. Here

several works one would expect to find are lacking. No mention is made of Mommsen's *Provinces* or Domaszewski's *Geschichte der röm. Kaiser*. Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire des Seleucides*, Rostowzew, *Studien zur Geschichte der röm. Kolonates*, and the article in *AJA*, XVI, 11 ff., by Buckler and Robinson on "Greek Inscriptions from Sardis" would have furnished good sources for a better treatment of the system of landholding than is given.

The book has a surprisingly large amount of material, is written in a pleasing style, and will be read by classical students with both pleasure and profit.

BRYN MAWR

J. F. FERGUSON

The Place-Names of England and Wales. By JAMES B. JOHNSTON, M.A. London: John Murray, 1915. Pp. 532. Octavo.

This work, a dictionary of English and Welsh place-names, giving to each the oldest known spellings and the probable derivation, is by the author of *The Place-Names of Scotland* (2d ed., 1903). It contains the names of all towns and villages mentioned in the *Postal Guide* (following its standard orthography), as also those of all mountains, rivers, and islands—in all some six thousand names.

The author, amid the duties of a provincial Scotch curacy, has labored twenty years on this work. He has had access to the libraries of Edinburgh and Glasgow for original sources—Old English charters and chronicles, the Domesday Book, and especially the recent issues of the *Close and Patent Rolls*, practically untouched heretofore. He gives (p. 528) a short bibliography of recent works used in the compilation, especially the work on the place-names of various English counties. The book, however, is hampered by the lack of a tabulated bibliography of original sources, which one must seek in W. G. Searle's *Onomasticon Anglo-Saxonicum*, 1897. Thus the work of Glidas of the sixth century, which speaks of twenty-eight cities of the Britons, is not mentioned, while that of Nennius, *Historia Britorum*, ca. 810 A.D., purporting to be a list of these cities, is mentioned often by the author, but the title is nowhere given. The author found the great English *Gazeteers* (e.g., *Cassell's* and *Brabner's*, each in 6 vols.) of little use, as also the two articles in the last edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, "Place-Names of England," by A. Mawer, IX, 417-18; "Place-Names of Wales," by H. M. Vaughan, XXVIII, 260. The etymologies in the *Oxford Dictionary* have been largely used. A few names are not precisely located, a difficulty for scholars outside of England; e.g., Cotteswold Hills (p. 216), Gateshead (p. 272), Hawxley-on-Coquet (p. 295).

The work makes no pretensions to completeness, but is merely a beginning in a field in which no other conspectus has as yet appeared. The study of English place-names is still young. Apart from notes to *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, the first work of permanent value in this field is the *Place-Names of Cambs*, by W. W. Skeat, which appeared in 1901. The case with Wales is still worse; the

only book dealing with the whole subject is the very unscientific *Place-Names of Wales*, by T. Morgan (2d ed., 1912). The list in the *Britannica* article mentioned is characterized (p. 67) as that of a "tyro." The author is certainly wrong in stating (p. 69) that in Wales "no Roman inscriptions have yet been found," as also (p. 70) that in the *Antonine Itinerary* "we can identify only three names of today, and there is doubt even among these." He says (p. 4) that this Antonine road-book—which is the best account of Keltic names, containing twenty-two town- and eleven river-names—was put into final shape in 380 A.D., a statement which, though correct, is misleading, as the compilation belongs to the beginning of the third century.

The Introduction contains nine short chapters (pp. 1-83) explanatory of the dictionary, which forms the bulk of the work (pp. 87-532). In the second chapter, on "Roman and Latin Names," which is especially interesting to classical students, the author points out (p. 5), what is not generally apprehended, that the name Chester, found alone or in combination, is not the certain sign of Roman origin or even proof of the existence of a former *castra* on the site. Though numerous, none of these *castra* names goes back as a name to Roman days. Some, like Alia Castra for Alcester, are spurious inventions; Chester itself as a name is late; few are earlier than the beginning of the Old English chronicles; thus Gloucester is first found in a grant of 681 as Gleaweceasdre and Worcester is nearly as early. Consequently, *castra*, OE *ceaster*, is a Saxon rather than a Roman appellative. Similarly, few names of today embody the Latin *colonia*, e.g., Lincoln, Colchester. Very possibly the latter merely means "Camp on the Colne," and this river-name is Keltic, so that Colchester appears to be of Keltic and Saxon and not of Roman manufacture. There are almost no real Latin names in England.

In the chapter on the "Keltic Element," the most difficult problem in the names of England and Wales, the author unscientifically differentiates, on the basis of dolichocephalic skulls which prove the existence of a pre-Keltic race, between Keltic place-names (he lists some four hundred on pp. 18 ff.) and pre-Keltic ones (he lists twenty as possible on p. 22). He believes these pre-Aryan names are confined chiefly or altogether to rivers, e.g., Biddle, Bollin, Croco, etc. There is no linguistic proof, however, that these names are not Keltic. On p. 7 he says the Aryan Kelts came to England "not a great many centuries before Julius Caesar"—a statement which needs revision in the light of recent investigations into the age of Indo-European speech groups in Europe. He is probably right in saying (pp. 7-9) that the fifty *Ogam* inscriptions found in Wales, West Devon, and Cornwall, date from late in the Roman occupation and are the work of the early Goidels (Gaels) who came over from South Ireland to Pembroke, while of the earliest Goidels in England we know next to nothing. He suggests that the Brythons, who followed the Goidels into Britain, came from the tribes of the Belgae, since a comparison of neolithic skulls of England and Belgium shows great similarities. He points out that too much stress has been laid on the number of English Kelt names (especially

of rivers), but goes to the other extreme in saying (p. 8) that over a large area of England there "are next to no Keltic names at all." The derivation of *Ox* in Oxford (p. 11) and of the *Isis* (the Latin name of the Thames above Oxford) from the Keltic root *uisce*, "water" or "river" (spelled variously now as *axe*, *exe*, *esk*, *usk*) is interesting. However, his equation of Gateshead (on-Tyne, p. 272) with Gabrosentum, deriving the latter from Keltic *gabar* "goat," is probably wrong. Gabrosentum was probably on the west and not on the east coast of Britain, and doubtless stood at the end of an old Roman road, so that the name is not Keltic but Saxon (from OE *seat* "gate," and not from *sat* "goat").

In the chapter on "Wales, Monmouth and Cornwall," the author is right in stating that few Roman *castra* names survive. His suggestion (pp. 67-68, 185) that Cardiff is derived from Welsh *caer* or *car*, "fort," and Didius, the Roman general, who, in 50 A.D., fought against the British tribe of the Silures of that region, is a good solution of the much disputed etymology of that name. If it is correct Cardiff is one of the earliest Roman stations in Britain.

The book, with all the shortcomings inevitable in a pioneer work in such an enormous and complicated field, is deserving of much commendation. It not only arouses the widespread and natural curiosity of every reader interested in the origin of English names, but it gives many sidelights on the complex history of Britain and explains many of the racial idiosyncracies of the various peoples which have inhabited it.

WALTER WOODBURN HYDE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

This work, a dictionary of English and Welsh place-names, giving to each the oldest known spellings and the probable derivation, is by the author of *The Place-Names of Scotland* (2d ed., 1903). It contains the names of all towns and villages mentioned in the *Postal Guide* (following its standard orthography), as also those of all mountains, rivers, and islands—in all some six thousand names.

The author, amid the duties of a provincial Scotch curacy, has labored twenty years on this work. He has had access to the libraries of Edinburgh and Glasgow for original sources—Old English charters and chronicles, the Domesday Book, and especially the recent issues of the *Close and Patent Rolls*, practically untouched heretofore. He gives (p. 528) a short bibliography of recent works used in the compilation, especially the work on the place-names of various English counties. The book, however, is hampered by the lack of a tabulated bibliography of original sources, which one must seek in W. G. Searle's *Onomasticon Anglo-Saxonicum*, 1807. Thus the work of Glidas of the sixth century, which speaks of twenty-eight cities of the Eritons, is not mentioned, while that of Nennius, *Historia Britorum*, ca. 810 A.D., purporting to be a list of these cities, is mentioned often by the author, but the title is nowhere given. The author found the great English *Gazeteers* (e.g., *Cassell's* and *Brabner's*, each in 6 vols.) of little use, as also the two articles in the last edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, "Place-Names of England," by A. Mawer, IX, 417-18; "Place-Names of Wales," by H. M. Vaughan, XXVIII, 260. The etymologies in the *Oxford Dictionary* have been largely used. A few names are not precisely located, a difficulty for scholars outside of England; e.g., Cotteswold Hills (p. 216), Gateshead (p. 272), Hawxley-on-Coquet (p. 295).

The work makes no pretensions to completeness, but is merely a beginning in a field in which no other conspectus has as yet appeared. The study of English place-names is still young. Apart from notes to *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, the first work of permanent value in this field is the *Place-Names of Cambs*, by W. W. Skeat, which appeared in 1901. The case with Wales is still worse; the

hended, that the name Chester, found alone or in combination, is not the certain sign of Roman origin or even proof of the existence of a former *castra* on the site. Though numerous, none of these *caster* names goes back as a name to Roman days. Some, like Alia Castra for Alcester, are spurious inventions; Chester itself as a name is late; few are earlier than the beginning of the Old English chronicles; thus Gloucester is first found in a grant of 681 as Gleaweceastre and Worcester is nearly as early. Consequently, *caster*, OE *ceaster*, is a Saxon rather than a Roman appellative. Similarly, few names of today entirely like *Latin colonia*, e.g., *Lincoln*, *Colchester*. The latter merely means "Camp on the Colne," and this river-name is Keltic, so that Colchester appears to be of Keltic and Saxon and not of Roman manufacture. There are almost no real Latin names in England.

In the chapter on the "Keltic Element," the most difficult problem in the names of England and Wales, the author unscientifically differentiates, on the basis of dolichocephalic skulls which prove the existence of a pre-Keltic race, between Keltic place-names (he lists some four hundred on pp. 18 ff.) and pre-Keltic ones (he lists twenty as possible on p. 22). He believes these pre-Aryan names are confined chiefly or altogether to rivers, e.g., Biddle, Bollin, Croco, etc. There is no linguistic proof, however, that these names are not Keltic. On p. 7 he says the Aryan Kelts came to England "not a great many centuries before Julius Caesar"—a statement which needs revision in the light of recent investigations into the age of Indo-European speech groups in Europe. He is probably right in saying (pp. 7-9) that the fifty *Ogam* inscriptions found in Wales, West Devon, and Cornwall, date from late in the Roman occupation and are the work of the early Goidels (Gaels) who came over from South Ireland to Pembroke, while of the earliest Goidels in England we know next to nothing. He suggests that the Brythons, who followed the Goidels into Britain, came from the tribes of the Belgae, since a comparison of neolithic skulls of England and Belgium shows great similarities. He points out that too much stress has been laid on the number of English Kelt names (especially

of rivers), but goes to the other extreme in saying (p. 8) that over a large area of England there "are next to no Keltic names at all." The derivation of *Ox*-in Oxford (p. 11) and of the *Isis* (the Latin name of the Thames above Oxford) from the Keltic root *uisc*, "water" or "river" (spelled variously now as *axe*, *exe*, *esk*, *usk*) is interesting. However, his equation of Gateshead (on-Tyne, p. 272) with Gabrosentum, deriving the latter from Keltic *gabar* "goat," is probably wrong. Gabrosentum was probably on the west and not on the east coast of Britain, and doubtless stood at the end of an old Roman road, so that the name is not Keltic but Saxon (from OE *zeat* "gate," and not from *zat* "goat").

In the chapter on "Wales, Monmouth and Cornwall," the author is right in stating that few Roman *castra* names survive. His suggestion (pp. 67-68, 185) that Cardiff is derived from Welsh *caer* or *car*, "fort," and Didius, the Roman general, who, in 50 A.D., fought against the British tribe of the Silures of that region, is a good solution of the much disputed etymology of that name. If it is correct Cardiff is one of the earliest Roman stations in Britain.

The book, with all the shortcomings inevitable in a pioneer work in such an enormous and complicated field, is deserving of much commendation. It not only arouses the widespread and natural curiosity of every reader interested in the origin of English names, but it gives many sidelights on the complex history of Britain and explains many of the racial idiosyncracies of the various peoples which have inhabited it.

WALTER WOODBURN HYDE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Recent Books

Foreign books in this list may be obtained of Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 West 27th St., New York City; G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-55 West 25th St., New York City; F. C. Stechert Co., 29-35 West 32d St., New York City.

- ANDERSON, MABEL L. *A Study of Vergil's Descriptions of Nature*. Boston: Badger. Pp. 224. \$1.25 net.
- HARRIS, R. *Picus Who Is Also Zeus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 8vo, pp. 80. 4s.
- LEONARD, W. E. *Lucretius' Of the Nature of Things*. A metrical translation. London: Dent. 18mo, pp. 313. 4s 6d. net.
- LIVINGSTONE, R. W. *A Defence of Classical Education*. New York: Macmillan. Cr. 8vo, pp. 289. 4s. 6d. net.
- MENDELL, C. W. *Latin Sentence Connection*. New Haven: Yale University Press. 8vo, pp. 215. \$1.50 net.
- REDFIELD, N. L. *The Golden Verses of Pythagoras*. Explained and translated into French by FABRE D'OLIVET. Done into English by NAYÁN LOUISE REDFIELD. New York: Putnam. Pp. 7+278. \$3.00 net.